DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 081 UD 022 647

TITLE	Oversight Hearings on Urban Education. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session (Washington, D.C., October 27, and 28 and Los Angeles. California, November 6, 1981).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	241p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; Hearings; *School Effectiveness; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 97th

ABSTRACT

This report presents the text of hearings on urban education and focuses on what makes urban schools effective instruments of learning and why urban school students consistently achieve above national norms on standardized reading, writing, and mathematics tests. Specifically considered are (1) the impact of the federal government's budget cuts on education; (2) legislative proposals; (3) classroom instructional conditions; and (4) programs necessary to improve education. Among those who testified were educators (educational administrators, professors and teachers) and community leaders. The report contains verbatim and written statements, letters, and supplemental materials. (WAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226081

UD 022 647

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON URBAN EDUCATION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON
OCTOBER 27, 28; AND NOVEMBER 6, 1981

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
91-113 O WASHINGTON : 1982

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
EUGENE JOHNSTON, North Carolina
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho

CONTENTS

Hearings held in:

Washington, D.C.: Page
  October 27, 1981 1
  October 28, 1981 51
Los Angeles, Calif. on November 6, 1981 83

Statement of—

Anderson, Hon. Glenn M., a Representative in Congress from the State of California 120
Bernstein, Harriet, senior associate, Council for Basic Education 9
Cota, Alex 198
Edmonds, Ronald, professor, School of Education, Michigan State University 21
Edwards, Rondle E., superintendent, East Cleveland City Schools, East Cleveland, Ohio 57
Esparza, Sophia, executive director, Parents Involved in Community Action (PICA) 179
Francis, Bob 188
German, Sandra 200
Handler, Harry, superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District 86
Hasan, Nisaa, organizer of Parent Power 200
Haynes, Carrie A., retired principal 140
Hendrix, Clifford L., Jr., assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services, Chattanooga Pubic Schools, Chattanooga, Tenn. 66
Jackson, Mitchell, chairman, Los Angeles Unified School District African American Education Commission 155
Loughran, Paul A., assistant superintendent, Mahopac Central School District, New York 70
McKenna, George, principal, George Washington High School 145
Rodriguez, Ron 190
Rosenshine, Barak, professor, School of Education, University of Illinois 5
Searls, Gloria, executive director, International Children's School 175
Torres, Art, assemblyman, 56th District, California Assembly 125
Van Meter, Estelle, 82d Street Block Improvement Club 135
Walters, Rita, member, Board of Education, Los Angeles Unified School District 92
Woods, Al, Food Services Department, Los Angeles Unified School District 97
Zimmerman, William, treasurer, United Teachers-Los Angeles 111

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—

Arreola, Raul P., director, Mexican American Education Commission, Board of Education, city of Los Angeles, prepared statement presented by 202
Edmonds, Ronald, Michigan State University:
  "Making Public Schools Effective," from Social Policy, September/October 1981, article entitled 42
  Prepared statement of 14
Edwards, Rondle E., Ph. D., superintendent, East Cleveland City Schools, East Cleveland, Ohio, prepared statement of 52
Esparza, Sophia, executive director, Parents Involved in Community Action, prepared statement of 185
Handler, Dr. Harry, superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District:
  Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated January 26, 1982 110
  Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 3, 1982 107
  Prepared statement of 89
Haynes, Carrie A., prepared statement of 143

CCC 4

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Page
- Hendrix, Dr. Clifford L., Jr., assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services, Chattanooga Public Schools, Chattanooga, Tenn., prepared statement of 62
- Jackson, Mitch, chairperson, African American Education Commission, prepared statement of 160
- Matsui, Hon. Robert T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, letter to Chairman Perkins, enclosing letter from Esther Franklin, dated March 15, 1982 236
- McKenna, George J., III, principal, George Washington High School and president, Council of Black Administrators, Los Angeles Unified School District, prepared statement of 152
- Mitchell, Hon. Parren J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland:
  - Baltimore city public schools testimony on:
    - Dropouts, truancy, retention, and drugs 230
    - Drug abuse in schools 228
  - Clarke, Mary Pat, 2nd district, Baltimore City Council, letter from, dated July 1, 1981 235
  - Deshields, Thomas, president, Gwynns Falls Park Junior High School, testimony dated July 1, 1981 226
  - Greater Baltimore Committee, statement submitted by 210
  - Lawson, Quentin, director, Human Development for the city of Baltimore, prepared statement of 233
  - Letter to Chairman Perkins, enclosing several documents, dated July 23, 1981 205
  - Newman, Joseph P., lieutenant, Baltimore Police Department, statement of, dated July 1, 1978 208
  - Opening remarks of, dated July 1, 1981 206
  - Williams, Percy V., Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Md.:
    - Memo to Hon. Parren J. Mitchell, enclosing impact statement, dated June 22, 1981 212
    - Testimony of, dated July 1, 1981 224
- Moore, Alfred S., principal, Los Angeles Unified School District, 95th Street Preparatory School, Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Congressman Hawkins, dated December 1, 1981 202
- Rosenshine, Barak V., University of Illinois, prepared statement of 2
- Searls, Gloria, executive director, International Children's School, Los Angeles, Calif., prepared statement of 178
- Torres, Art, assemblyman, Los Angeles, Calif., prepared statement of 128

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON URBAN EDUCATION

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1981

House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 9:40 a.m., in the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Goodling, Erdahl, Hawkins, Petri, Kildee, and Ratchford.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel, and John Smith, senior professional assistant.

Chairman Perkins. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is beginning oversight hearings today on urban education.

In recent years public education has come under severe scrutiny, evaluation, and criticism. Some critics have said that public schools have not lived up to their mission of effectively teaching our children to read, write, and do arithmetic.

But in listening to these critics, we must not forget that many schools and school districts have achieved this mission with great effort, courage, and dedication. These achieving schools and school districts are located in innumerable communities through the United States. Some are in rural areas, some are in the suburbs, and some are in urban centers of this Nation.

This morning we will be dealing with effective urban schools. The question we will focus on is, what happens in these schools to make them effective instruments of learning and why do their students achieve above the national standardized test norms in reading, writing, and arithmetic year after year?

Today we have a distinguished panel of educators who have been leaders in the research study of effective schools in urban America. They are here to help us understand what instructional conditions are needed to create the kind of educational climate which can cause an effective school to be so defined.

We are hopeful that after receiving this panel's testimony, this subcommittee will be able to more clearly define what role the Federal Government must take in order to promote an effective school climate throughout this Nation.

We will continue this series of hearings in Washington tomorrow and in Los Angeles on November 6.

We're delighted to have the panel here this morning. Dr. Barak Rosenshine, professor at the School of Education, University of Illinois. Come around please. And Ms. Harriet Bernstein, senior associate, Council of Basic Education. Mr. Ronald Edmonds, professor at School of Education, Michigan State University. All the remainder of the panel come around and take your seats at the table here this morning.

The other two witnesses, are they here?

UNKNOWN VOICE. Mr. Edmonds is a little late.

Chairman PERKINS. All right. Take your seat there at the table. Is Mr. Edmonds here? All right. He's late. We'll go ahead.

Mr. Hawkins, I know you are interested in this issue. You may want to make a statement at this time.

Mr. HAWKINS. No, I have no statement to make at this time. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for the interest that you've demonstrated in arranging these hearings and particularly your decision to have the second one in Los Angeles. We certainly look forward to the witnesses. I think an excellent choice has been made in those who have been invited and I would not want to take any time away from them because like yourself I look forward to their testimony.

Chairman PERKINS. All right. Dr. Rosenshine, go right ahead. And without objection, Doctor, your statement will be inserted in the record. Proceed in any manner you prefer.

[The prepared statement of Barak Rosenshine follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BARAK V. ROSENSHINE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

EFFECTIVE TEACHING

I am here to testify that today we know a great deal about effective instruction for all children, and that the funding and support of the federal government has played a major role in developing this knowledge.

I have observed many classrooms in effective and successful elementary schools in the inner city of Philadelphia, East St. Louis, San Jose, and Jackson, Michigan. I visited these classrooms because they were using specific programs which the research has shown to be particularly effective for teaching poor children. I also wanted to see how the instructional principles which had emerged from the general research literature were being implemented in these classrooms.

EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

The instruction which I saw in those schools matched the findings on effective instruction which have been recently developed through educational research. Some of the major points include: a large number of academic engaged minutes per day, classrooms which are academically focused and teacher-led, instruction in groups, instruction in small steps using a demonstration-prompt-independent practice format, large amounts of student independent practice, and students working at a high level of success.

Academic engaged minutes.—Learning takes time, and the number of minutes per day that a student is engaged in academic activities is an excellent predictor of student achievement. In the urban schools I visited the students were engaged in reading, language, and mathematics for a minimum of three hours per day.

Academic focus.—Successful classrooms have a strong academic focus. Teachers who make a difference in students' achievement are those who put students into contact with curriculum materials and find ways to keep them in contact. They assigned homework frequently and helf students accountable, and tested frequently. The most effective teachers also spent less time on non-academic activities such as arts and crafts, or asking students open-ended questions about their personal feelings and opinions. This last sentence is somewhat surprising because it has frequently been argued that some non-academic activities contribute to academic gain by motivating students or by providing additional stimulation. Such indirect enhancement was not evident in any of these studies.

Effective instruction is characterized by a great deal of teacher-led instruction directed at the whole class or toward a group of students. The realities of a classroom of 20-25 students prevent a teacher from spending much time instructing students on a one-to-one basis. If the teacher has only 20 students and instructed each one on a one-to-one basis, then each child would receive only three minutes of instruction per hour and would be expected to work alone for 57 minutes each hour.

Demonstration-prompt-practice.—We are learning that instruction is most efficient when it takes place in a demonstration-prompt-practice format. The teacher presents the first piece of the skill, then the students practice this piece with prompts from the teacher, and then the students practice without the prompts. Then the next piece is taught in the same model-prompt-practice procedure, and then the next, and finally the skills are integrated using the same model-prompt-practice procedure. Throughout this cycle, the emphasis is upon obtaining a high percentage of correct responses from the students. When student errors appear, the demonstration and prompted practice is repeated. The teacher continues these model-prompt-practice procedures until the students are successful, confident, and firm.

The presentation is organized so that only one skill is taught at a time, and chances for confusion are minimized. Whenever possible, rules and procedures are taught, so that the students can use the rules to answer to do the next problem.

Frequent, independent practice.—After the first demonstration phase students have attained a high level of success, but they respond slowly because the material is new. Hence, effective instruction requires that students spend a good deal of time practicing the new material. The objective of this practice is not mindless drill. Quite the opposite. The objective of the practice is to become so quick and so automatic that we don't have to think about the pieces but can put all our energy into thinking about the whole. For example, a reader who is using a lot of energy to decode the words has very little energy left to understand the meaning of the sentence.

Thus, effective classrooms provide for a great deal of successful, independent practice. This practice not only includes word lists and math facts, but also extensive reading of books and extensive work on math problem solving.

A successful program for teaching mathematics contains all these steps. In the teacher's manual developed by Thomas Good and Douglas Grouws of the University of Missouri, the teachers were taught to (a) demonstrate the skill to be learned to the entire class, and (b) supervise the students and provide prompts as they worked through examples. When students made errors, then the demonstration and prompted practice were repeated. Finally, the students spent time doing a good deal of independent practice without teacher instruction. In two studies, one in Tulsa, Oklahoma and one in Milwaukee, students of teachers who received these training packages and followed the instructions made dramatic gains in mathematics.

This general pattern has appeared in a number of successful studies for all types of learners. However, this procedure of small steps with supervised practice, and continued practice until the learners are "firm" is particularly effective for "easily confused learners." "Easily confused" is not a new euphamism of urban poor, rather, it refers to all learners who are learning new skills for which they do not have a strong background. I use these same procedures during the first weeks when I teach graduate statistics classes, and I seek out teachers who use these procedures when I learn new areas such as cognitive psychology or skiing.

As we list these points—a large amount of engaged time, academic focus, instruction which used demonstration-prompt-practice, a high frequency of successful practice—one worries that the successful classroom are dull, task-oriented workplaces where the students are mindlessly going through routines led by cold, regimented teachers. This was not true. If you have heard these rumors, I urge you to visit these classrooms. The classrooms were indeed academically focused, and three hours or more per day was allocated to academic work. But the instruction was so well designed that the instruction seemed effortless. The kids were proceeding through the task easily and successfully, and there were smiles, and hugs, and mutual help. Best of all, the kids were confident, cocky, and firm about what they knew.

One worries that in classrooms which are academically focused and use intensive direct instruction there won't be room for inquiry and excitement and simple wonder. But I saw all these things in the classroom I visited, and they emerge in my university classes when I use these same methods. Success breeds excitement, and those first attempts to apply something new to a new situation is exhilerating. When those kids in East St. Louis successfully worked new long division problems, the students were very excited.

Although I saw a number of outstanding teachers, not all teachers were outstanding. I would estimate that 20 percent of the teachers were outstanding, 60 percent were average but successful, and 20 percent were below average.

MAKING URBAN SCHOOLS MORE EFFECTIVE

If school district personnel want to improve the quality of their school programs, where can they turn? I suggest two major sources: the validated Follow Through sites, and new teacher training materials.

Follow Through regional resource centers

I am particularly impressed by the schools in the Follow Through program which have been validated by the National Diffusion Network of the Department of Education. The impressive, successful schools which I visited in Philadelphia and in East St. Louis are among those schools. Follow Through schools and sites are particularly valuable because these programs have been in operation for more than ten years. The Follow Through programs with the largest number of validated sites are the Oregon Direct Instruction Model, the Kansas Behavior Analysis Model, and the Bank Street College Model. Each of these models have Regional Resource Centers which can provide teacher training, and the sponsors also have funds for teacher training. I would strongly urge personnel from the cities to study the programs used at these sites, visit them, and adapt the most suitable one for their school or district.

Unfortunately, funding is a problem. In order to make a program work an essential component is a well trained on-site supervisor who can provide help for on-going teachers and train new teachers who enter the program. Because of cut-backs, many sites are no longer able to fund the on-site supervisor.

Teacher training programs

A second source for improving instruction is validated teacher training programs. One program which impressed me and which was validated by the National Diffusion Network is ECRI or Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction. It is a highly structured program for teaching reading, reading comprehension, creative writing, and study skills, and can be used with existing reading series. I have observed classrooms using this program in the inner city of San Jose and the inner city of Jackson, Michigan and I have been very impressed with student achievement, their industriousness, and the confidence with which they approach learning.

Other teacher training programs which have resulted in increased student achievement when presented to inservice teachers include those developed by Tom Good and Douglas Grouws (University of Missouri), Linda Anderson and her colleagues (Michigan State University), Madeline Hunter (UCLA), Carolyn Evertson and her colleagues (University of Texas), Edmund Emmer and his colleagues (University of Texas) and N. L. Gage and his colleagues (Stanford University). On the basis of the data to date, I can recommend all of these programs for use in inservice training. With the exception of Madeline Hunter's program, all of these programs were funded by the National Institute of Education.

I would also recommend that everyone interested in improving the quality of urban education read Robert Benjamin's book "Making Schools Work." He has looked at successful elementary schools for the urban poor, provides detailed descriptions about how and why these schools are successful, and elaborates upon the problems these schools and programs have faced from the education community. For those with limited time, I strongly recommend chapters 1, 3 and 7.

WILL THE SCHOOLS ADOPT THE SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS?

Right now, most of the available successful programs involve highly structured, teacher controlled instruction in settings in which academic achievement is THE major goal. However, these programs have not achieved wide acceptance.

The idea of academic engaged time is readily acceptable by teachers, administrators, and professors. But as one talks about time spent efficiently in a highly structured, teacher-controlled environment the opposition grows. When one discussed direct instruction and the model-prompt-practice format, then one hears cries that these programs "stifle creativity," "fail to educate the whole child," are "authoritarian," and do not recognize that "each child is unique and learns in a unique way." Unfortunately, programs that are successful in teaching children are not necessarily adopted by teachers and school districts.

Sometimes we're evenly split in our views of these programs. In an excellent evaluation of a school which was using the ECRI approach, the report stated that half the teachers loved the program because it was structured, well-organized, and predictable, and half the teachers disliked the program because it was structured, well-organized, and predictable.

For the immediate future, I would guess that moderately structured programs will be most acceptable. Programs which emphasize engaged time, student success, and mastery learning, but which are less prescriptive than DISTAR or ECRI. Some of the teacher training programs which have recently been developed appear to lie in the middle ground.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Rosenshine, B. V. Content, time, and direct instruction. In P. L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg (Eds.) "Research on Teaching." Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1979.

Rosenshine, B. V. How time is spent in elementary classrooms. In Carolyn Denham and A. Lieberman (Eds.) "Time to Learn." Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education, 1980.

Rosenshine, B. V. Direct instruction. "Journal of Education," 1978, 160, 38-66.

STATEMENT OF BARAK ROSENSHINE, PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Dr. Rosenshine. I am here to testify that we do know a great deal about effective instruction for all children, and that the funding and support of the Federal Government has played a major role in developing this knowledge.

I have observed many classrooms that are effective and successful in urban settings. I've visited these schools in the inner city of Philadelphia, East St. Louis, San Jose, and Jackson, Michigan. I visited these classrooms for two reasons. One is I had heard that they were effective classrooms and I wanted to see what was going on in these classrooms that were making them effective. And second, I had read the education literature on what made for effective teaching and wanted to see if what went on in these classrooms matched.

And looking at these classrooms and the literature I can summarize some of the points about effective teaching in four or five major points.

The importance of a large number—the importance of time. A large number of academic engaged minutes per day. The importance of academic focus classrooms where time is spent on instruction. Directly so. The importance of instruction using small steps in which a teacher begins with a short demonstration, provides prompts and models for the students as they learn. And follows this with student independent practice where they demonstrate whether or not they have gotten it. And then the teacher recycles if there is any problem.

The successful schools—the research is showing that there's a large amount of independent practice and finally the importance of students working at a high level of success.

I'd like to go into some of these points in more detail. Learning takes time and if one wants to look at the best predictor of achievement it would be the number of minutes per day that a kid is actively engaged in learning. And not only actively engaged, but engaged at a high level of success. And in some schools this is as high as 3 hours. And particularly in the successful schools this gets up to 3 hours of successful time in reading and math instruction.

Academic focus. Effective instuction is characterized by this emphasis on academic achievement. Teachers who make a difference are putting students in contact with the materials and finding ways to keep them in contact. The most effective teachers spent less time on nonacademic activities such as arts and crafts or asking students open ended questions about their personal feelings and opinions.

This last sentence is somewhat surprising because it's frequently been argued that some nonacademic activities contribute to gain by motivating children or by providing additional stimulation. This indirect motivation was not observed. It was the direct kind that was important.

As educators, as researchers we're just now starting to understand instruction. I am shocked at how little I have known these past years. And we can begin to characterize what effective instruction is.

It involves this demonstration prompt practice where a teacher first presents a small piece, prompts the students as they learn and then listens to the student as they practice. If there are problems, the teacher recycles this demonstration-prompt and practice.

The emphasis is upon obtaining a high percentage of correct responses from students. And this is continued until the students are cocky, confident and firm.

After that there's a need for a great deal of independent practice in these classrooms. And the successful classrooms are spending hours doing this.

This general pattern of small steps with supervised practice and continued practice until the learners are firm is particularly effective for easily confused learners. Easily confused is not a new euphuism for urban poor, rather, it refers to all learners who are learning new skills for which they don't have a strong background. I use these same procedures of model prompted practice independent practice when I teach my statistics classes at the University of Illinois. I use these same procedures when I teach my educational psychology classes. And I feel almost compelled now to stop and say: OK, we have had the demonstration, now let's go into the prompted practice. What are the four points that I've talked about. Write them down. Confer, you know, talk to your neighbor. Be sure you have these points before we go on.

That kind of instruction is as important as much for urban kids as it is for any of us when we're learning new areas. When I learn skiing this is how I want to be taught. When I'm studying cognitive psychology, as I am today, this is how I want to be taught.

One worries that engaged time, academic focus, a high frequency of successful practices—you worry that these classrooms are dull, task-oriented places where the students are mindlessly going through routines led by cold, regimented teachers. This is not true. If you've heard these rumors, I urge you to visit these classroooms. I've seen them. These classrooms were indeed academically focused, and 3 hours or more per day was allocated to academic work, but the instruction was so well designed that the instruction seemed effortless. And the kids were proceeding through the tasks easily and successfully. And there were smiles, hugs and mutual help. And best of all, these kids were confident, cocky, and firm about what they knew.

I sat in classrooms in East St. Louis, which is really a drab city. And watched these kids go through long division with this verve and fervor. And watched them apply the problems and was just impressed with the excitement with which they were doing this. And they're confidence and their success. And what impressed me more is that in this particular case 3 days before I had visited 5th grade classrooms in Danville, Ill., and the kids weren't nearly as successful as what I saw in the third grade in East St. Louis. So, this can happen when the instruction is well organized.

Now, if people want to make their urban schools more effective, what can they do? Well, they can take these points and apply them to their classroom. At the same time we now have—there are two recommendations I have. We now have Follow Through regional——

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a question at this point. You mentioned East St. Louis. Were any of these programs federally funded?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. All were. Coming down—East St. Louis was title I federally funded. The successful programs in Philadelphia were title II, federally funded. The successful programs in San Jose and Jackson, Mich., right in the center of Jackson, Mich., were funded through the National Diffusion Network, I think it was title VI, but they were all federally funded.

Chairman, PERKINS. Can you tell us whether there was any difference in the effectiveness of those programs that were federally funded and those that were not?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. Everything that I have found in the research literature, with one exception, was federally funded. All the schools that I choose to visit were either federally funded or the primary development came through Federal funds. I have not seen, personally, or read or known of famous schools in my area that has come without strong Federal funding.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. Did you choose to visit any of those that were nonfederally funded?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. I hadn't heard of them. I choose to visit the schools that I had heard had specific programs and were successful.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, how did you select the ones that you chose to visit? Was it because they were named as effective schools or was it because—were they randomly selected?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. No. I chose the schools in Philadelphia and the ones in East St. Louis because they were part of the Follow Through program. And they had emerged in the Follow Through research as two of the most successful Follow Through models. The Follow Through program has nine models. The current research has shown that two or three of these models are the most successful. I visited two of the models. The Oregon direct instruction model which was being implemented in East St. Louis and the Kansas behavior analysis model which was being implemented in Philadelphia.

Both of these cities, East St, Louis and Philadelphia, have been validated by the National Diffusion Network for dissemination. And it was because they had been validated that I visited them.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Well, the import of the question is merely to try to ascertain whether or not the results that you obtained were somewhat biased because you chose to visit only schools that were federally funded. I'm not in any way in opposition to what you are saying, but in order to make sure that the results were not biased and that we couldn't draw a conclusion that there are not—that only federally funded schools have proved to be effective. Do you know of any that are not federally funded that have been mentioned or identified or sought out by you that would be effective?

Dr. **ROSENSHINE**. This is not—I am not qualified to talk about those. The nature of my research was such that I had to follow—that I follow the Follow Through program and did a lot of work through that. If there are—Ron Edmonds has looked at more successful schools which would probably include some that were not federally funded. In Robert Benjamin's book, "Making Schools Work" there appear to be some schools that are not strongly federally funded and that have been successful.

In my own research it has turned out that I've looked at programs that were successful, not merely schools, but programs. And if I'm going to look at national—at programs that have been implemented around the country, then these programs were either federally funded or received a great deal of funding from Federal money.

So, I suspect that my sample is limited because I looked at programs. Not merely schools, but programs that have been effective around the country.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Doctor, you may proceed. I think you were interrupted.

Dr. **ROSENSHINE**. Thank you. And I would suggest and I am impressed with these programs. And if people want to improve their urban schools, I would suggest that they turn to these programs. And now the National Diffusion Network of the Department of Education has set up regional resource centers in Follow Through. And the Follow Through programs which have the largest number of validated sites are the Oregon direct instruction model, the Kansas behavior analysis model and the Banks Street College model.

Each of these models have regional resource centers which can provide teacher training and the sponsors also have funds for teacher training. I would strongly urge personnel from the cities to study the programs used at these sites, visit them, and adapt the most successful one for their school or district.

In addition there are some teacher training programs which are now available nationally. In particular I was impressed with one which was validated by the National Diffusion Network. Yes, I guess that a lot of my direction came out of what I heard and a lot of what I heard came out of what was validated by the National Diffusion Network which—in which there was a lot of Federal funding.

I'm particularly impressed with the ECRI or the Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction program. It's a highly structured program for training teachers in the teaching of reading, reading comprehension, creative writing, and study skills. I've observed classrooms using this program in the inner city of San Jose and in the inner city of Jackson, Mich., and I've been very impressed with the student's achievement, their industriousness and the confidence with which they approach learning.

There are other teacher training programs which have resulted in increased achievement when presented to inservice teachers. These have been developed primarily by university researchers. And as I look over the list, the work of Tom Good at University of Missouri; Linda Anderson at Michigan State University; Carolyn Evertson at University of Texas; Edmund Emmer, University of Texas; N. L. Gage, Stanford University. In each case these are NIE funded teacher training programs.

I would also recommend anyone interested in improving the quality of urban education read Robert Benjamin's book "Making Schools Work." He's looked at successful schools and has detailed descriptions about how and why these schools are successful.

Will the schools adopt these successful programs? They have not achieved wide acceptance. Even the schools—the kinds of programs I saw in East St. Louis, Philadelphia, San Jose, Jackson has not achieved wide acceptance in the schools.

If I talk about the importance of academic engaged time, then it's accepted. If I talk about time spent efficiently in a highly structured teacher controlled environment, then the opposition grows. If I discuss direct instruction, a model-prompt-practice format; then one hears cries that these programs stifle creativity, fail to educate the whole child, are authoritarian and do not recognize that each child is unique and learns in a unique way. Unfortunately programs that have been successful have also been subject to this sort of criticism and are not readily adopted by teachers and school districts. And sometimes the teachers themselves are evenly split in their view.

I read an evaluation of this ECRI program and as I read the evaluation half the teachers in the program loved it because it was structured, well organized, and predictable and half the teachers hated it because it was structured, well organized, and predictable.

And I am—the problem—in many ways one can document the existence of these programs, frequently they're brought in and they're thrown out. I can say I know I have seen programs that work. I can tell you why they work. But I don't know how to insure that they will be adopted by principles, teachers in urban areas. Perhaps one has to be—some new programs I've seen that are moderately structured will be more easily adapted. Whether or not they'll be successful, we don't know yet.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Rosenshine. The next witness is Ms. Harriet Bernstein.

STATEMENT OF HARRIET BERNSTEIN, SENIOR ASSOCIATE, COUNCIL FOR BASIC EDUCATION

Ms. BERNSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Harriet Bernstein, representing the Council for Basic Education. And we are honored to be asked to give testimony at these hearings about urban schools and the Federal role in urban education.

The Council for Basic Education is not primarily a research organization, and I do not come here today as a scholar, but as an advocate for a position on urban education. For 25 years, the Council for Basic Education has been steadfast on two major points:

First, that every American school child is entitled to a basic education, by which we mean not only reading, writing, and arithmetic, but also literature, science, history, geography, Government, the arts, and foreign languages.

Second, that every child unless he is severely retarded, is capable of learning those basic subjects, at least to a level that would permit him to be a productive person and a good citizen.

Until very recently, this simple message was either not heard or not believed by very many educators. Over most of the history of the Council for Basic Education that viewpoint has seemed hopelessly elitist by those who did not really believe that disadvantaged students could learn basic academic subjects.

Over the last several decades, it has become part of the conventional wisdom to believe that basic academic subjects were for the upper classes, but the masses needed some form of practical education which would render them suitable for work in an industrial society. The tendency to withhold a real education from the many was further fueled by the end of segregated schooling. Suddenly confronted with a large number of black children who had been shortchanged for generations, the schools responded by blurring distinctions between success and failure in the name of equality.

In the years since *Brown*, school has become easier in this country. Textbook reading levels have dropped; requirements have been eased; and the burden of failure has gradually shifted from the students and teachers to the wicked and unjust society at large.

An army of researchers came forward to justify the academic failure of poor and minority children on the basis of social deficits and deficits in the children themselves. The burgeoning testing industry supplied us with aggregate data and average test scores, proving that poor and minority kids did less well in school on the average, than their white and advantaged peers. Those who found it convenient to pay less attention to poor and minority students were consoled by the national statistics and the average test scores of minority groups.

Social reformers came to see academic failure as an inevitable companion of poverty, and a condition that would not be remedied unless there were a revolutionary redistribution of power and money. Always there was this tieup between poverty and failure; between race and failure; and between money and redemption.

The design of Federal education programs grew out of those assumptions and positions. In 1965, when ESEA was passed, child-deficit and social deficit theories were white hot, and freshly minted out of the very best universities, and associated with liberal enlightenment and a developed social conscience.

But while those great social experiments in education were unfolding, divergent bodies of research were forming. In 1968, Rosenthal and Jacobson published their book, "Pygmalion in the Classroom," which reported on their research into the powerful effects of teacher expectations on students' learning. And although their particular approach to researching expectations has not withstood the test of subsequent replications, they did set in motion the series of studies which would attest to the power of people's beliefs about student potential, and begin to turn some eyes away from the mechanistic input mentality of the late 1960's—a time when improvement was usually equated with more aides, smaller classes, more books, and better equipment and supplies.

In 1971, George Weber, who was then associate director of the Council for Basic Education, published a study called "Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools." Weber's intention was to disprove James Coleman, who was then saying that family background was all powerful and schools had no noticeable effect on student outcomes. Weber believed that Colemanism gave intellectual support to those who wanted an excuse for failure. Weber found four inner-city elementary schools whose students were from predominantly low-income and minority families, and who were being successfully taught to read to a level that would have done credit to the average suburban school.

There was an immediate flurry of reaction to Weber's research. The New York Times and the black press gave his findings a big play. And the successful schools that had been identified in the book were pilloried, according to Weber, by their less successful colleagues. And that is one of the problems with this kind of approach of identifying successful schools. It is very difficult for those schools that have been identified. Success was dismissed by the others on the grounds that the particular school had—just happened to have a lucky mix of students, or an unusually good principal or faculty.

But Weber's paper had breached a wall. He had demonstrated that effective urban schooling was possible. Finding just one school would have been enough to rebut Coleman; but Weber found four for good measure. It was a bitter pill to swallow for those who justified their platform of income redistribution on the grounds of urban school failure. It was a blow to those who had come to believe that work was a middle-class hang up. And it was a threat to those whose prominence in life depended on their stewardship over failed people.

After Weber's ground-breaking work, there followed a series of scholarly efforts along the same lines—Ronald Edmonds, whom I suppose you'll hear today. Dr. Rosenshine, whom you've heard, Lawrence Lezotte, Brophy, Good, and others. And in England, a team of British researchers studying inner city London high schools reached the same conclusions that Ronald Edmonds reached here: And that is that schools do make a difference. That effective urban schools have strong leaders—strong principals who are committed to the academic mission of the school primarily. That these schools are successful—are businesslike and friendly places that don't waste time. That expect all students to learn the material. And that maintain an orderly atmosphere. Effective schools keep close tabs on student progress and understand how to modify program on the basis of test results. They make sure that teachers assign homework, since homework helps students consolidate learning from school. In successful schools, the faculty has a coherent and consistent vision of what the school is about and how the students and faculty should behave. There is a school-wide ethos.

The virtually identical findings of Ronald Edmonds in the United States and Michael Rutter in England are supported by a growing number of researchers and practitioners. So, ladies and gentlemen, the evidence is beginning to pile up. And it is not based on theories of human behavior. It is not based on the hope of societal transformation or political coalition. It is based on proven successes in ordinary, run-of-the-mill urban schools. And it suggests some direction in which we need to go for improved urban education.

Much of the school effectiveness research and practice suggests changes that can only be made by teachers and the principals in the individual schools. Most of the charactertistics of successful urban schools are under the control of the school, and that is very hopeful news. But school districts, States, and the Federal Government might be instrumental in bringing this hopeful body of research and practice to the attention of local schools. Changes in attitudes, changes in priorities, changes in beliefs are at the root of school effectiveness, and although those kind of changes don't involve large outlays of money, they do require some funding for staff training and whole-faculty planning. And they are the kind of changes that require leadership—leadership at all levels of government.

The Federal compensatory education programs, particularly title I, were born with the noblest intentions, but I believe that they are misshapen by the social theories that were prevalant in the 1960's. Their very language betrays the underlying premise that poor and minority children are somehow defective; and thus the need for compensation, remediation, diagnostics, prescriptions, treatments, and isolation—a medical model based on the notion of poverty as a sickness.

The Congress need to monitor closely the Federal dollar has led to pullout programs and even though the Federal Government claims that pullout strategies are not required by Federal regulation, the fact is that federal monitors virtually require it in order for the school districts to prove that money was spent only on eligible children. But pullout has been demonstrated over and over again to be an ineffective educational strategy. It has segregated children from their peers; deprived them of mainstream instruction; and acted to lower expectations for their learning.

Title I has stood on the belief that things that money could buy—aids, specialists, books, supplies, and equipment—would compensate or equalize education for disadvantaged students. Title I also expressed an assumption about the relationships between parents and school officials—it assumed that school officials were trying to get away with something and that parents would be instrumental in keeping the schools on the path of righteousness.

My point in mentioning these underlying premises of Federal categorical programs is to show the differences in perception and understanding between 1965 and now. Current research on success in urban schooling would not support the child-deficit assumption that are inherent in title I and other Federal programs. It would not support the idea of pullout programs. It would not place very much stock in equalizing educational outcomes through compensatory largess. It would prefer parent and school relationships that work together toward educational goals for specific children's learning, rather than an adversarial concept built on the idea of monitoring.

Most importantly, Federal categorical programs, as they are now designed, have built-in disincentives to success. Money is initially awarded on the basis of educational failure; and after a while, there is a small cadre of school employees who have a vested interest in the perpetuation of that failure. Should the children succeed, they would eventually lose the money that supports their jobs.

There are those who say that title I has been a success. And looking at it from one point of view you could certainly say that. They point to the fact that title I children make a month's gain for every month in school. But for the inner-city child who enters junior high school reading on a fourth-grade level, the fact that he is making steady progress is very small comfort. The results achieved by the compensatory approach just aren't good enough in a society that has almost no work for the unskilled or semiliterate. Urban youth who are needed to work in high technology industries cannot succeed there with a minimal education. They must be able to read on a fully adult level and do math problem solving. Most of all they must be able to reason and that skill is not acquired in a minimalist school. Even those youths who are destined for the military need to read on at least a 10th-grade level in order to cope with advanced military technology. There is no escape. We have to improve education in the cities, and do it soon.

Fortunately, we have this phenomenon of successful urban schools. And their numbers are growing and the body of research about them is also growing. Their presence on the scene gives us hope and direction when we need it most.

The Council for Basic Education hopes that the Congress will find ways to support this promising trend through research and dissemination. We also hope that the next reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be accomplished in a manner which replaces low expectations with high expectations; which will reward success rather than codify failure; and which will rely more on sound ideas than on uncertain dollars. Federal money is still needed in our urban centers, but we need it to promote the excellence that we now know is possible.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Bernstein. The panel has now been joined by Mr. Ronald Edmonds, professor of the school of education at Michigan State University. Mr. Edmonds we welcome you to the panel. And as soon as you've completed the prepared statement or statement that you care to make, we will then direct questions to the three panelists. We are very delighted to have you. You've served on many advisory groups and participated in many of the seminars that the Chair has been responsible for sponsoring and for that service and your strong commitment to education, we certainly want to applaud you this morning and look forward to your testimony.

Mr. EDMONDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All I really intend is a fairly brief summary of the remarks I've prepared and submitted. The paper is divided into three parts. The first part is a review of the literature to which my colleague was referring a few minutes ago. That is the first part of this paper is a reference to a body of research that is fixed on identifying and analyzing characteristics of effective schools and I'm not going to say very much about that because council and your colleagues can read that at their leisure.

[The prepared statement of Ronald Edmonds follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RONALD EDMONDS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

I have been asked to review what we know now of effective city schools. In pursuit of that assignment this paper is divided into two parts. Part I is a review of the research, including my own, that forms the substantive basis for our conclusions regarding the characteristics of effective schools. To the extent that this part of the discussion is repetitive for those of you familiar with this research I apologize and urge you to skip to Part II. Part II of this discussion examines the use of the research as the basis for programs of school improvement in New York City and a number of other cities.

The paper ends with summary observations regarding both the research and its implementation.

PART I

Let us begin with those school studies that are most explicit in identifying and advocating particular school characteristics. Weber was an early contributor to the literature on the school determinants of achievement in his 1971 study of four instructionally effective inner city schools. Weber intended his study to be explicitly alternative to Coleman, Jensen, and other researchers who had satisfied themselves that low achievement by poor children derived principally from inherent disabilities that characterized the poor. Weber focused on the characteristics of our inner city schools in which reading achievement was clearly successful for poor children on the basis of national norms. All four schools had "strong leadership" in that their principal was instrumental in setting the tone of the school; helping decide on instructional strategies; and organizing and distributing the schools' resources. All four schools had "high expectations" for all their students. Weber is careful to point out that high expectations are not sufficient for school success but they are certainly necessary. All four schools had an orderly, relatively quiet, and pleasant atmosphere. All four schools strongly emphasized pupil acquisition of reading skills and reinforced that emphasis by careful and frequent evaluation of pupil progress.

Weber goes on to identify and discuss additional reading personnel, phonics, and individualization as important to the instructional success of the four schools. I'll not endorse or pursue these Weber findings: first because subsequent research does not sustain their relevance as it does leadership, expectations, atmosphere, reading emphasis, and assessment; and second my own research, of which more will be said later, giver greated weight to the first mentioned variable than the latter.

Despite these reservations my own view is that Weber was essentially correct both in concept and basic research design considering the relative modesty of his enterprise.

In 1974, the New York State Office of Education Performance Review published a study that confirmed certain of Weber's major findings. New York identified two inner city New York City public schools, both of which were serving an analogous, predominantly poor pupil population. One of the schools was high-achieving and the other was low-achieving. Both schools were studied in an attemptto identify those differences that seemed most responsible for the achievement variation between the two schools. The following findings were reported:

> the differences in student performance in these two schools seemed to be attributed to factors under the school's control;
>
> administrative behavior, policies and practices in the schools appeared to have a significant impact on school effectiveness;
>
> the more effective inner city school was led by an administrative team which provided a good balance between both management and instructional skills;
>
> the administrative team in the more effective school had developed a plan for dealing with the reading problem and had implemented the plan throughout the school; and
>
> many professional personnel in the less effective school attributed childrens' reading problems to nonschool factors and were pessimistic about their ability to have an impact, creating an environment in which children failed because they were not expected to succeed. However, in the more effective school, teachers were less skeptical about their ability to have an impact on children.

This study has shown that school practices have an effect on reading achievement. At the very least, the children in low achieving schools should have the opportunities available to the children of the high achieving schools. These opportunities, which do not result from higher overall expenditures, are clearly within the reach of any school today.

For our purposes these findings reinforce the relevance of leadership, expectations, and atmosphere as essential institutional elements affecting pupil performance. If further evidentiary support for these findings is wanted, you are invited to close scrutiny of the 1976 Madden, Lawson, Sweet study of school effectiveness in California. In a more rigorous and sophisticated version of the Weber and New York studies Madden and his colleagues studied 21 pairs of California elementary schools matched on the basis of pupil characteristics and differing only on the basis of pupil performance on standardized achievement measures. The 21 pairs of schools were studied in an effort to identify those institutional characteristics that seemed most responsible for the achievement differences that described the 21 high-achieving schools. Compared to the low-achieving schools the high-achieving schools had: greater principal support; greater teacher effort; a more orderly and task oriented classroom atmosphere; more time spent on various subjects like social studies; limited and non-instructional use of teacher aides; greater access to materials; highly limited faculty influence on overall instructional strategy; more support services from district administration; and greater teacher job satisfaction.

My own conclusion is that aside from intrinsic merit the California Study is chiefly notable for its reinforcement of leadership, expectations, atmosphere, and instructional emphasis as consistently essential institutional determinants of pupil performance.

I want to close this part of the discussion with summary remarks about a recent and unusually persuasive study of school effects. In 1977 W. B. Brookover and L. W. Lezotte published their study of "Changes In School Characteristics Coincident With Changes In Student Achievement." We should take special note of this work partly because it is a formal extension of inquiries and analyses begun in two earlier studies both of which reinforce certain of the Weber, Madden, et al, and New York findings. The Michigan Department of Education "Cost Effectiveness Study" and the Brookover et al study of "Elementary School Climate and School Achievement" are both focused on those educational variables that are liable to school control and important to the quality of pupil performance. In response to both of these studies the Michigan Department of Education asked Brookover and Lezotte to study a set of Michigan schools characterized by consistent pupil performance improvement or decline. The Brookover, Lezotte study is broader in scope than the two earlier studies and explicitly intended to profit from methodological and analytical lessons learned in the "Cost Effectiveness . . ." and "Elementary School Climate . . ." studies.

Since the early 70's the Michigan Department of Education has annually tested all Michigan pupils in public schools in grades four and seven. The tests are criterion referenced standardized measures of pupil performance in basic school skills. Over time these data were used by the Michigan Department of Education to identify elementary schools characterized by consistent pupil performance improvement or decline. Brookover and Lezotte chose eight of those schools to be studied (6 improving, 2 declining). The schools were visited by trained interviewers who conducted interviews and administered questionnaires to a great many of the school personnel. The interviews and questionnaires were designed to identify differences between the improving and declining schools, which differences seemed most important to the pupil performance variation between the two sets of schools. The summary results follow.

"1. The improving schools are clearly different from the declining schools in the emphasis their staff places on the accomplishment of the basic reading and mathematics objectives. The improving schools accept and emphasize the importance of these goals and objectives while declining schools give much less emphasis to such goals and do not specify them as fundamental.

2. There is a clear contrast in the evaluations that teachers and principals make of the students in the improving and declining schools. The staffs of the improving schools tend to believe that all of their students can master the basic objectives; and furthermore, the teachers perceive that the principal shares this belief. They tend to report higher and increasing levels of student ability, while the declining school teachers project the belief that students' ability levels are low and, therefore, they cannot master even these objectives.

3. The staff of the improving schools hold decidedly higher and apparently increasing levels of expectations with regard to the educational accomplishments of

their students. In contrast, staff of the declining schools are much less likely to believe that their students will complete high school or college.

4. In contrast to the declining schools, the teachers and principals of the improving schools are much more likely to assume responsibility for teaching the basic reading and math skills and are much more committed to doing so. The staffs of the declining schools feel there is not much that teachers can do to influence the achievement of their students. They tend to displace the responsibility for skill learning on the parents or the students themselves.

5. Since the teachers in the declining schools believe that there is little they can do to influence basic skill learning, it follows they spend less time in direct reading instruction than do teachers in the improving schools. With the greater emphasis on reading and math objectives in the improving schools, the staffs in these schools devote a much greater amount of time toward achieving, reading, and math objectives.

6. There seems to be a clear difference in the principal's role in the improving and declining schools. In the improving schools, the principal is more likely to be an instructional leader, be more assertive in his instructional leadership role, is more of a disciplinarian and perhaps most of all, assumes responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic objectives. The principals in the declining schools appear to be permissive and to emphasize informal and collegial relationships with the teachers. They put more emphasis upon evaluation of the school's effectiveness in providing a basic education for the students.

7. The improving school staffs appear to evidence a greater degree of acceptance of the concept of accountability and are further along in the development of an accountability model. Certainly they accept Michigan Educational Assessment Program tests as one indication of their effectiveness to a much greater degree than the declining school staffs. The latter tend to reject the relevance of the MEAP tests and make little use of these assessment devices as a reflection of their instruction. (MEAP refers to Michigan Educational Assessment Program.)

8. Generally, teachers in the improving schools are less satisfied than the staffs in the declining schools. The higher levels of reported staff satisfaction and morale in the declining schools seem to reflect a pattern of complacency and satisfaction with the current levels of educational attainment. On the other hand, the improving school staffs appear more likely to experience some tension and dissatisfaction with the existing condition.

9. Differences in the level of parent involvement in the improving and declining schools are not clear cut. It seems that there is less overall parent involvement in the improving schools; however, the improving school staffs indicated that their schools have higher levels of *parent initiated* involvement. This suggests that we need to look more closely at the nature of the involvement exercised by parents. Perhaps parent initiated contact with the schools represents an effective instrument of educational change.

10. The compensatory education program data suggests differences between improving and declining schools, but these differences may be distorted by the fact that one of the declining schools had just initiated a compensatory education program. In general, the improving schools are not characterized by a high emphasis upon paraprofessional staff, nor heavy involvement of the regular teachers in the selection of students to be placed in compensatory education programs. The declining schools seem to have a greater number of different staff involved in reading instruction and more teacher involvement in identifying students who are to be placed in compensatory education programs. The regular classroom teachers in the declining school report spending more time planning for non-compensatory education reading activities. The decliners also report greater emphasis on programmed instruction.

Before making summary remarks about the policy import of these several studies I want to say something about my own research, "Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children." This discussion will describe our ongoing efforts to identify and analyze city schools that are instructionally effective for poor and/or minority children. I am pleased to note that we have already developed unusually persuasive evidence of the thesis we seek to demonstrate in the research under discussion. Our thesis is that all children are eminently educable, and the behavior of the school is critical in determining the quality of that education.

The "Search for Effective Schools" project began by answering the question: "Are there schools that are instructionally effective for poor children?" In September of 1974, Lezotte, Edmonds, and Ratner described their analysis of pupil performance in the twenty elementary schools that make up Detroit's Model Cities Neighborhood.

All of the schools are located in inner-city Detroit and serve a predominantly poor and minority pupil population. Reading and math scores were analyzed from Detroit's Spring 1973 use of the Standford Achievement Test and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Of the 10,000 pupils in the twenty schools in the Model Cities' Neighborhood, 2500 were randomly sampled. With minor variation, the sample included eight pupils per classroom in each of the twenty schools. The mean math and reading scores for the twenty schools were compared with citywide norms. An effective school among the twenty was defined as being at or above the city average grade equivalent in math and reading. An ineffective school was defined as below the city average. Using these criteria, eight of the twenty schools were judged effective in teaching math. Nine were judged effective in teaching reading and five were judged effective in teaching both math and reading.

We turned next to the problem of establishing the relationship between pupil family background and building effectiveness. Two schools among the twenty, Duffield and Bunche, were found that were matched on the basis of eleven social indicators. Duffield pupils averaged nearly four months above the city average in reading and math. Bunche pupils averaged nearly three months below the city reading average and 1.5 months below the city math average.

The similarity in the characteristics of the two pupil populations permits us to infer the importance of school behavior in making pupil performance independent of family background. The overriding point here is that, in and of itself, pupil family background neither causes nor precludes elementary school instructional effectiveness.

Despite the value of our early work in Detroit, we recognized the limitations of the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. Our evaluation of school success with poor children had depended on evaluating schools with relatively homogeneous pupil populations. The numbers of schools were too few to justify firm conclusions. Finally, the achievement tests were normative, as was the basis for determining building effectiveness among the twenty schools. Even so, valuable lessons were learned in Detroit from which we would later greatly profit.

The second phase of the project was a reanalysis of the 1966 Equal Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS) data. Our purpose was to answer a number of research questions that required a data base both larger and richer than had been available to us in the Model Cities' Neighborhood analysis. We retained our interest in identifying instructionally effective schools for the poor, but in addition we wanted to study the effects of schools on children having different social backgrounds. Such an inquiry would permit us to evaluate school contributions to educational outcomes independent of our ability to match schools on the basis of the socioeconomic characteristics of their pupils.

Summarizing and oversimplifying results, we found at least 55 effective schools in the Northeast quadrant of the EEOS. Our summary definition of school effectiveness required that each school eliminate the relationship between successful performance and family background. The effective schools varied widely in racial composition, per pupil expenditure, and other presumed determinants of the school quality.

The "Search for Effective Schools Project" is now completing its analysis of social class, family background, and pupil performance for all Lansing, Michigan pupils in grades three through seven. We have identified five Lansing schools in which achievement seems independent of pupil social class. The achievement data are: local and normative; and state and criterion. We use both sets of data to identify schools in which all pupils are achieving beyond minimum objectives including most especially those children of low social class and poverty family background. We have gathered similar data for Detroit pupils in the elementary grades in schools whose pupil population is at least 15 percent poor.

The on-site study of Lansing's effective schools as compared to ineffective schools took place during the 78-79 and 80-81 school years. Our basic notions of the character and origin of effective and ineffective school differences derive from work we've already done in combination with the Lansing analysis and the New York City case studies.

What effective schools share is a climate in which it is incumbent on all personnel to be instructionally effective for all pupils. That is not of course a very profound insight but it does define the proper lines of research inquiry.

What ought to be focused on are questions such as: What is the origin of the climate of instructional responsibility; if it dissipates what causes it to do so; if it remains what keeps it functioning? Our tentative answers are these. Some schools are instructionally effective for the poor because they have a tyrannical principal who compels the teachers to bring all children to a minimum level of mastery of basic skills. Some schools are effective because they have a self-generating teacher corps that has a critical mass of dedicated people who are committed to be effective for all the children they teach. Some schools are effective because they have a highly politicized Parent Teacher Organization that holds the schools to close instructional account. The point here is to make clear at the outset that no one model explains school effectiveness for the poor or any other social class subset. Fortunately children know how to learn in more ways than we know how to teach thus permitting great latitude in choosing instructional strategy. The great problem in schooling is that we know how to teach in ways that can keep some children from learning almost anything and we often choose to thus proceed when dealing with the children of the poor.

Thus one of the cardinal characteristics of effective schools is that they are as anxious to avoid things that don't work as they are committed to implement things that do.

I want to close this part of the discussion by describing as unequivocally as I can what seem to me the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools. They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept together. Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement. The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand. Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of the basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities. When necessary school energy and resources can be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives. The final effective school characteristic to be set down is that there must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored. These means may be as traditional as classroom testing on the day's lesson or as advanced as criterion referenced system-wide standardized measures. The point is that some means must exist in the school by which the principal and the teachers remain constantly aware of pupil progress in relationship to instructional objectives.

PART II

I want now to describe my efforts to use this work as the basis for basic reforms in the policies and programs of the New York City Public Schools. In 1978 I was invited to become chief instructional officer of the New York City Public Schools and to use my research as the basis for improving teaching and learning in the New York City Public Schools.

The first thing I did when I went to the city was to articulate a pedagogical party line. I wrote, publicly disseminated, and professionally circulated the teaching and learning premises from which the New York City schools were to proceed from the point on.

First the New York City school system now presumes that all the children in school are educable. Premise two is that this system presumes that the educability of the children derives far more from the nature of the school to which they are sent than it derives from the nature of the family from which they come. If the research has taught us anything so far, it has taught us that while Coleman, et al are correct in the assertion that pupil performance is highly correlated with family background, they are profoundly incorrect in the conclusion that family background is the cause of pupil performance. This was one of the primary questions to which we addressed ourselves as researchers. We concluded that it is not family background that determines pupil performance. It is school response to family background that determines pupil performance.

I then undertook changes in the way central administration is organized. The changes were designed to make the system more receptive to the importance of what I have been doing. We also addressed the other major research conclusion that has application to how you approach the issue of change. The controversial questions is what effect is more powerful in the analysis of achievement. Is the teacher effect most powerful, the familial effect most powerful, the school effect most powerful or the district effect most powerful? We have concluded, pretty firmly, that the mose powerful force at work in the issue of achievement is the school effect. That is, the school effect is much more powerful than the individual teacher effect. This statement is not meant in any way to dismiss teachers or to denigrate the critical character of their role in the issues of skills acquisition. It is merely to say, and I suspect your own experiences have long since demonstrated this that poor schools are sufficiently powerful to depress otherwise creative, energetic, productive, instructional personnel. Conversely, instructionally effective schools are sufficiently powerful to raise otherwise mediocre people to levels of instructional effectiveness to which they might not ordinarily have thought they could inspire.

The topic I want to focus on now is the direct intervention in a cross section of City schools. The New York City public schools have more than 1,200 schools. It was fairly clear to me early on that I was not going to be able to do what I wanted if I had to intervene in each one of those schools one at a time. What I did was to design a project called the School Improvement Project.

Through this project I entered the New York City schools with a program of intervention that is predicated exclusively on the school characteristics referred to a few moments ago. I have brought together a group of men and women in New York City who are called school liaison people. They have been trained in the import of these school characteristics and assigned to the schools that are participating in the School Improvement Project. Their job is to walk the administrative and instructional personnel of the school through an evaluation of the school's relative strength and weakness with respect to each of the characteristics to which I referred. The outcome of that examination is what we call the Needs Assessment Document. The document has been prepared primarily by the liaison person but in fairly close collaboration with a representative group of people who have been convened in each participating school.

Each document talks with some specificity about the relative strength and weakness of the instructional leadership in the building, the relative strength and weakness of the instructional emphasis of the building, the relative strength and weakness of the climate of the building and so on through all of the characteristics. I then use these documents as a basis for making the decisions about what kind of technical assistance would bring the school on line. Bear in mind that the premise from which all this proceeds is that any school that has obtained the five characteristics all at once would immediately begin to show very substantial improvement in skills acquisition for precisely that portion of the pupil population that ordinarily profits least from the way we approach teaching and learning in city schools. For example, if the needs assessment says the principal in the building is found wanting in some aspect of instructional leadership. Then the question is "What can one do that would improve that principal's skills in the exercise of instructional leadership?" One of our very firm conclusions was that the principal of the school has to be the person to whom the instructional personnel look for instructional leadership in the school. If they do not, the implications for the building are considerably negative. We know that one of the measures of instructional leadership is that the principal has to visit classes, systematically observe, and systematically respond to the observations. Therefore, if we discovered that the principal just never did that, we might respond by assigning a person to work with the principal to teach what he or she might need to know in order to be a sophisticated and consistent evaluator of teacher performance in the classroom. This might mean that we would assign a retired principal with a twenty-year record of incontestable success in his methodology of visiting classes, sorting out what he sees, and responding to it. Or if the needs assessment says that the teachers are insecure about their use of achievement data, we might assign to the school a professor of measurement and say that we want the teachers to participate in seminars on reading assessment data or evaluating the achievement outcomes. Or we might assign a curriculum person because we want teachers trained better in how you use achievement data as a basis for program design and so on. The point I have been trying to make is that this process of intervention does not alter per pupil expenditure, does not add in any permanent way to the resources with which the school works, does not reduce class size, and does not add to the repertoire of services that the school has to offer. It merely sets out to help the school people see that there are ways to make better use of the resources already there.

I have designed in the New York schools a program that says children may not be promoted from any one grade to the next unless they can demonstrate on the basic of objective data their mastery of a sufficient minimum of school skills such as permit us to professionally predict that if they move on to the next grade they will be successful. If data will not permit you to make that prediction, then you can not move them. In New York City this will remain the primary responsibility of the 32 decentrailized districts which control the elementary and intermediate schools. Each district elects its own board and the board hires its own superintendent and the teachers are hired from a central list. We give them a central budget allocation, and so on. In this program you are denied the discretion of promoting exclusively on the basis of teacher judgement and in order to promote you must have the objective evidence of pupil mastery of the minimum skills of which we all hear so much. The program says that in the 4th grade and 7th grade, no matter what the decentralized district does, the central administration will itself administer the city-wide test in reading, writing, and math and interpret the results. This in a sense verifies whether or not the decentralized districts' criteria for promotion are in conformity with what is implied by the statement that no child is to move unless and until that child can demonstrate sufficient mastery of the bodies of knowledge and sets of skills that in the third grade are prerequisite for predictable success in the fourth grade. Many of you may be thinking that there is no justification for nonpromotion if all you can offer children is a repeat of what they just did. I understand that. One of the characteristics of the program is the understanding that children, particularly in the 4th and 7th grade, who do not get promoted will have the opportunity to participate in a program designed to correct the academic difficulties that constitute the objective explanation for why they did not get promoted.

I have made remarks about the program to illustrate the sorts of things that ought to be done in central administration to reinforce what is essentially a school-based design for improvement. My goal is that eventually all the schools in New York City will have their own school improvement program and not have to participate in a project in order for that to be true. To do that, central administration has to institutionalize its capacity to be a credible, procedural and substantive resource. We walk a school through a evaluation of its relative strength and weakness with respects to the characteristics I have mentioned and then made the important decision about what repertoire of technical resources need to be assigned in response to such deficiency as may have been found. We can use these experiences to evaluate what kinds of men and women representing what kinds of skills are needed to become permanent part of the curriculum division. This will eventually permit any one of the 1,200 schools to decide for itself who it wants in its own school improvement project. Then a school can turn to the central administration to say that it was determined that these and these are the kinds of technical assistance this particular school needs in order to made better use of those resources that it already has.

I'm happy to report that achievement has risen dramatically in the last three years. Aggregate New York City pupil performance is now above national norms as measured by the CAT. Disaggregration shows that while the gain has been city wide it has been greatest in those districts enrolling the largest proportions of low income children.

There have been equally dramatic improvements in the individual schools participating in the School Improvement Project.

I want now to briefly describe other programs of school improvement in several other cities.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin was the first school district to launch a formal project of school improvement based on the findings of the SES project. In 1978, the Milwaukee superintendent named Maureen Larkin to guide a program of instructional improvement aimed at twenty Milwaukee elementary schools designated by the superintendent as ineffective. "Project RISE" set out to implement programs of staff development, materials review and instructional redesign based on the assumption that the "RISE" schools must come to possess the five characteristics of effective schools identified by SES. It is interesting to note that the SIP schools in New York City were volunteers while the RISE schools in Milwaukee were not. There are other equally dramatic differences by one striking similarity. Ms. Larkin reports that the gains in achievement in the RISE schools are dramatic as is the case in the SIP schools.

Beginning in 1980 John Ervin, Vice President of the Danforth Foundation, set out to persuade school officials in St. Louis to permit him to implement a program of school improvement based on the findings in SES. During the 1980-81 school year Vice President Ervin in close collaboration with District Superintendent Rufus Young launched a program of school improvement in four inner city St. Louis elementary schools. The St. Louis design is heavily focused on staff development and an elaborate design for broad consultation and shared decision making. It is much too soon to have any basis for assessing project outcomes. It is interesting to note that in St. Louis, unlike New York and Milwaukee that initiative for school improvement came from outside the school system.

Perhaps the most extraordinary of the designs to be summarized is the "New Jersey Education Association School Effectiveness Training Program." Teacher unions are not often noted for formal programs of school improvement. The NJEA program is notable for its combination of formality and sophistication. The program is available on teacher demand and uses staff development as the major instrument of intervention.

Finally I want to note programs of school improvement in the state of Connecticut. In 1979 Mark Shedd, Connecticut Commissioner of Education, assigned Mary Jo Kramer of his staff the task of organization a State Department Office of School Improvemenmt. This state initiative took two forms. The state offers local districts small grants to encourage projects of school improvement based on the SES. New Haven is one of the recipients of such a grant and has organized a program being run from the office of New Haven Superintendent Gerald Tirizzi. The New Haven project is the only one known to me that includes all of the schools in the district.

The second form of the state initiative is technical assistance. The staff of Connecticut's Office of School Improvement has spent considerable time in New York City studying my research and the operation of the New York City School Improvement Project. Connecticut has modified the needs assessment instruments and has field tested them. Thus state department personnel are available to local school districts to teach them the techniques of assessing the five factors from the SES.

The impact of all these projects is their contribution to our knowledge of the means by which school districts can use research findings as the basis for local programs of school improvement.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

One of the most straight forward and widely disseminated outcomes of the SES project is its description of the five factors that characterize instructionally effective schools. The accuracy of the characteristics is reinforced by the findings in the New York City Case Studies. Moreover Leadership, Climate, Expectations, Instructional Emphasis and Assessment now form the basis for a number of projects of school improvement. We are thus compelled to face a number of issues that logically proceed from the SES.

While we can now be reasonably confident that the five characteristics are correlates of school effectiveness we do not know whether the characteristics are causes of school effectiveness. The outcome ot the school improvement projects in New York City and Milwaukee is sufficient to demonstrate the efficacy of a school intervention strategy based on correlates. Such programs would however be dramatically strengthened were we to make progress in our understanding of the origin of the institutional changes that produce improvements in teaching and learning.

Two bodies of knowledge offer immediate opportunities for strengthening strategies of school intervention based on the SES findings. The discipline of organizational development adds sophisticated process to the substance of the five factors. I know of no instances in which the lessons from Organizational Development inform the designs for school improvement associated with the SES. The bodies of knowledge and sets of skills that have derived from certain of the studies of teacher effects are of equally dramatic immediate applicability in designing programs of school improvement.

What is wanted here is research that seeks to integrate school effects, teacher effects and organizational development. I expect to pursue such an agenda as part of my work at the Institute for Research on Teaching at M.S.U.

Finally, it must be noted that the activities being reported on here are of little moment unless educational decision makers express an interest in using what we've learned about the characteristics of effective schools. After all one of the characteristics of effective schools is that they care about the quality of teaching and learning for all of their students. Unfortunately we know far more about the desirability of such caring than the means by which it is brought to pass.

STATEMENT OF RONALD EDMONDS, PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. EDMONDS. What I really wanted to talk about were briefly, three things. No. 1, a quick description of my own study of school effectiveness because it is illustrative of those to which I refer. And I think that a description of my own is in many respects a description of several.

Second, I wanted to talk about the use of that work in New York City and some other places because one of the interesting things about what's going on with the research in school effects is the extent to which at local school and at State initiative the work is increasingly being used as the basis for programs of actual school intervention. So, I wanted to make some brief descriptions of New York and Milwaukee and a few other places and say something about what the outcomes there are because fortunately we've been at it long enough now so that in addition to describing how we use it as a basis for designing actual programs of school intervention, we can also talk about what difference it makes. That is what do we have to show for the initiative that are now underway.

And finally I did want to briefly summarize what I think is sort of the state of the discourse on effective schooling which really derives from a larger question. The larger question being what is the interaction in the United States between pupil performance in school and pupil social class and family background.

That is to the extent that the Congress contemplates programs and funding and legislation, is it now more reasonable to design those programs on the basis of the conclusion that how well children do in school depends primarily on the nature of the family from which they come or is it more appropriate to design those programs and activities on the basis of the conclusion that the basic explanation of how well children do in school depends on the nature of the school to which they're sent and can be and often is relatively independent of the nature of the families from which they come.

Well, the study that I'm responsible for that set out to contribute at least to the answer to that question began by the simple device of asking the question are there any schools anywhere in the United States in which pupil performance is relatively independent of social class and family background.

More explicitly, in order to answer the question, we asked if we collected income social class family background data on a group of children in a number of cities throughout the United States in grades three through seven inclusive so that we would know with some specificity the social class of all of the children we were looking at. And then went back for those same children—that is having identified their social class we then went back and for those same children collected achievement data for all the years they'd been in school. So, that now we not only knew what their social class was we also knew how well they performed on every standarized test they ever took. We then asked the question of the data. Can we find any schools in which the proportion of low-income children demonstrating mastery of their school requirements is virtually identical to the proportion of middle-class children demonstrating mastery of their school requirements.

For example, the city of Detroit we presume that if you did an examination of the proportion of middle-class children in the fifth grade in Detroit consistently demonstrating mastery, you were probably looking at about the best in the way of instruction that Detroit had to offer and we could make the same statement about Chicago and Los Angeles and Cleveland, and so on.

So, that our standard for making the initial judgment goes—is got at by asking the question if you're talking about only middle-class children in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grade what proportion of them consistently learn what they need to know in order to be successful at the next level of schooling and a typical answer is somewhere between 94 and 99 percent. That is typically between about 94 and 99 percent of middle-class children consistently learn what they need to know in order to be successful at both the next grade and at the next level of schooling.

We then ask in the same schools in which we put the question could we find any schools then in which if 94 percent of the middle-class children were consistently successful, could we find schools in which 94 percent of the low-income children were consistently successful. And the answer was, "Yes. We did."

Now, this does not mean that we found schools in which poor children as a group were performing identical to middle-class children as a group. That is, these—even these schools that met our standard of effectiveness were still schools in which middle-class children as a group tended to do better than poor children as a group. But the reason we were willing to call the schools effective is because no significant proportion of either the low-income group or the middle-class group was falling below the minimum they needed to master in order to be virtually guaranteed success at the next level of schooling. And we could find schools that met that standard. That is we could find schools in which the distribution of achievement met the most rigorous standard of equity despite the fact that the achievement gap remained. But the floor of achievement rose and so far as we can tell, continues to rise fairly dramatically.

So that phase of the work merely went to the question are there any schools anywhere that can meet such a standard of effectiveness and we answered the question "Yes."

The second set of questions we asked of our data—well, given the fact that there do exist in the United States city schools in fairly typical urban circumstances serving demographically, typical pupil populations what is there about those schools that makes them that way? That is what's the difference between the schools that met our standard of effectiveness as contrasted to the ones that didn't when it was clear that what we were looking at were two groups of schools in which similarities were far greater than differences. That is, we were looking at two groups of schools that were approximately the same size, approximately the same income, social class distribution, virtually identical per pupil expenditure, pupil-teacher ratio. Issues of that kind.

In order to answer the second set of questions, I mean about—what the difference between the schools that met the standard of effectiveness as contrasted to the ones that don't. We paired each of the effective schools with an ineffective school. Saw to it that in doing the pairings each of them met some of those other controls that I mentioned. Racial composition, social class distribution, issues of that kind. We then designed a set of instruments to record school life. Trained a group of observers to use those instruments and put them in the paired sets of schools for extended periods of time to record school life.

Our observers were always blind as to whether they had been assigned to a school that was effective or ineffective. As a matter of fact we deliberately added a third group of schools that we characterized as being aggressively innoxious so that even if you were assigned either to an effective or ineffective school you wouldn't be quite so tempted to guess since we didn't want the recording of school life to be influenced by our observers knowing in advance that they had or had not been assigned to a school that met our standard.

In any case, our observers then used their observation time and used instruments to record school life across a broad range of institutional organizational variables. All those data came back to us. At that time I was still at Harvard University. The data came back to us at Harvard University and we subjected the data to a fairly straightforward analysis. Our analysis merely asked the question if you exclude from consideration institutional organizational characteristics that exist in both effective and ineffective schools. That is if you could exclude from consideration the fact that class size appears not to vary very much between effective and ineffective schools, racial composition appears not to vary very much. Age of the building appears not to vary and pupil teacher ratio appears not to vary and so on, will you end up with anything at all. Will you end up with any organizational institutional characteristics that exist in the set of effective schools and do not exist in the set of ineffective schools. That was the kind of analysis we subjected the data to and when our analysis was finished we ended with what I summarized as five characteristics.

The reason I say I summarized it is because language being what it is you might be able to say that these are seven characteristics. Or, you might be able to say that they're three. It is partly a function of language but the point is the list isn't all that long and neither do I think it to be particularly esoteric and I will describe in in a very few words, but I'll introduce it with two cautions.

No. 1, I'm going to describe these characteristics as consistently describing the schools that met our standard of effectiveness which is not the same as saying these characteristics are necessarily the cause of the difference we were observing. We know these characteristics to be the correlations. We're not sure whether or not they are the cause. I mean I'm not sure it matters because later on when I remark on their use you'll see that you can use correlates just about as effectively as you can use causes. But in any case, that is a caution.

The second caution, I'm necessarily going to recite these characteristics in some ordering, but it is not a rank ordering. That is I'm not—this recitation is not meant to imply that the third characteristic is less important than the first or more important than the fifth. We only know that the schools that met our standard had all of the characteristics and they had them all at once.

And they are first the fact that we detected very noticeable differences in the way principals behaved in effective schools as contrasted to the way principals behaved in ineffective schools. And to summarize that one very quickly it suffices to say that probably the most dramatic illustration is our conclusion that men and women presiding over ineffective schools tended to spend most of their time performing managerial functions from their offices. That is they tended to make their greatest investment of time and energy in budgetary decisions and organizational decisions in the physical decisions about the nature of the environment and they tended relatively speaking not to participate in the actual teaching and learning that described the school.

Wherein the effective schools the men and women who presided over those tended to behave in very different ways. That is they tended, for example, to spend relatively little time physically in their offices. They tended to spend most of their time out and about in the school and for the most part in being out and about in the school they were intimate parties to matters instructional. That is they were in classrooms participating in a program of instruction. They were conferring with teachers about the choice of materials or the organization of the classroom. Or they were evaluating whether this space is more instructional appropriate for this function than that and so on.

And to summarize it the men and women who met our standard of presiding over an effective school were notable for the fact that they were in fact the instructional leaders in their schools. I should say since I didn't—haven't said it already. I am talking here primarily about elementary and second, about intermediate. I am not talking about high schools at all. I mean I can do that, but it would be a very very different conversation.

I'm talking here about primarily elementary and intermediate schools.

Second set of characteristics that we concluded had to do with institutional emphasis or instructional emphasis and I can illustrate that most easily by telling you what we did in order to get at that particular variable. In these schools we convened a cross section of adults, teachers, parents, principal of the building, paraprofessionals. Adults who represented the men and women who worked or had to do with the larger school community. And we asked them all the same question. And the question was—some variation of, What does this place care most about? What does this school emphasize? What does it regard its primary outcome? So forth.

Now, in recording the answers to those questions our evaluations revealed that variation in the substance of the answer tended not to make much difference. Tended not to be the correlate of the difference we were interested in. What tended to be the most dramatic correlate was the pervasiveness of the adult understanding of whatever the answer to the question was.

I mean I can most easily illustrate that by saying everytime we asked a principal this question—What does this school care most about? Principals of course always answered—answered at considerable length. Often with substantial documentation, eloquence, and persuasiveness. And we then went on and asked the rest of the adults only to make the discovery that the only person in the building in ineffective schools who answered the question the way principal did was the principal.

And then one of it's major characteristics is that the definition of institutional emphasis tended to vary as a function of who was answering the question.

Conversely, in the effective schools the most notable difference on this variable was the fact that all adults tended to answer the question the same way. That is they didn't say to us—they didn't say they believed it. They didn't even say they liked it, but they sure made it clear they knew the answer. And I don't think that's a particularly extraordinary observation, but the point is one of the characteristics of these effective schools is this pervasive understanding of what the institutional emphasis is suppose to be. Which I think is another manifestation of leadership, if you will, because it also gives the principal of this building the opportunity to monitor the relationship between adult behavior and whether or not it advances what institutional emphasis is suppose to be.

Third set of characteristics had to do with climate. Climate is probably the least ambiguous most straightforward of our examinations. I mean this word climate in schools is defined in various and sundry ways. And let me make clear that for the most part I'm using a fairly tangible definition of what climate is.

Climate here refers to relative orderliness. Relative cleanliness, relative physical repair, and so on. And I'll give you a quick illustration of that. We were interested, for example, in answering the question—do effective schools have any greater incidence or lesser incidence of broken windows than ineffective schools? And so we—you know, that wasn't all that hard to do. We counted broken windows in the paired sets and matched it to see whether or not we detected any significant variation in the incidence of broken windows. We also counted burned out light bulbs. I mean you can see how you could do a variety of measures on something like that.

And we had to conclude that relatively speaking virtually no variation at all. But that the variation was in how long it took to fix the window and how long it took to replace the burned out light bulbs. That is in ineffective schools relatively speaking it tended to take a long time. Whereas in effective schools it tended not to take a long time.

Now, the reason I emphasize here that that is a correlate of effectiveness is because clearly whether or not you replace a light bulb is not the cause of achievement, but I do think that what's going on in that particular variable is that those things are stand-ins for adult attention to the environment. Schools that have broken windows and holes in the walls and broken furniture and those things are not attended to, is simply—it seems to me in the interpretive sense of it another way of saying to the children we don't really care about this place. We don't take it so seriously that we'll replace bulbs when they burn out and fix windows when they get broken and so forth and so on.

The fourth set of characteristics are probably the most ambiguous because they're the most interpretive. And that has to do with our interpretation of the children's interpretation of the teacher's expectations.

The reason I say that to you it's actually—it's not quite as complicated as it sounds. But I can illustrate it fairly quickly. We recorded, for example, in classrooms the relationship between pupil participation in recitation and pupil social class. That is we wanted to question—is there any variability in incidence of participation as a function of whether we're looking at an effective or ineffective school and the conclusion was fairly straightforward.

One of the characteristics of ineffective schools is that pupil participation in recitation tends not to be random. That is the children most likely in ineffective schools to answer a question are those children most likely to know the answer. Children most likely to participate in a variety of things that go on in the classroom are children most likely to be middle class. Children most likely to be white. I mean however you want to construct it so that you get a nonrandom distribution of the phenomenon of recitation.

Whereas in effective schools it tended to be quite the opposite. That is children participating in recitation the rise and fall of that tended to be absolutely independent of their color, the nature of their language, their sex, their size, and so on. And I think that the reason that's true—I mean I'm saying again that the correlate is the incidence of participation. If you want to go on and speculate about what there is about it that influences the phenomenon of expectation, I think it's the following:

I think that if you are for example a lower class black boy and you're in a classroom that's mixed. And day after day you note that the teacher only calls or prefers to call on children who are middle class and brightest and well prepared and that sort of thing, eventually I think what happens is that these lower class children conclude that the teacher does not expect them to know the answer to questions. And in any case the teacher tends not to care all that much about whether they know the answer in relationship to how the teachers feel about other kinds of children.

In the effective schools the difference is that all children are virtually compelled to conclude that they have as much chance of being asked to answer a question as any child. That is that—I mean I'll give you one quick illustration of that and I'll move on quickly.

We noted,for example, a classroom teacher that began each day with a blank piece of 8½ by 11 inch paper and as the day went on the teacher made dots on this piece of paper and we were mystified as to what that represented. And upon asking discovered that the teacher began the day with this blank piece of paper and then if the teacher called on that gentleman there in the upper right hand corner of this room to answer a question the teacher made a dot on this paper that approximated the student's location in the room. And as the day went on the teacher repeated that procedure. And her reason for doing that is her intent that at the close of every schoolday the distribution of those dots should approximate the distribution of children in the room.

Now, the role that has in expectation it seems to me is fairly straightforward. It merely means that it wouldn't take you very long of being a student in such a class to come to understand that even if you didn't get asked to answer a question, the probability of your being asked was as great as it was for anybody. And it seems to me that that is one of the things effective schools do. Is that they do manage to convey the idea that the people that run this place expect all these children to obtain certain levels of mastery and they comport themselves in ways that reinforce that.

The final set of characteristics I want to mention have to do with the schools use of evaluation. That is the kind of evaluation you get out of standardized achievement data and that merely means that in ineffective schools when pupil performance on standarized achievement tests reveals that a significant number of children are not doing particularly well, ineffective school people tend to explain that away. They tend to say these children aren't doing well because they're poor, because they're linguistically unsophisticated, because they have cognitive difficulties and nutritional deprivations and so. And the upshoot of it is that having explained that away school personnel then go on to do whatever they've been doing.

On the other side of the coin, in the effective schools whenever pupil performance on achievement data reveal that a significant proportion of the population isn't doing what they should, then the school people make the decision to do things differently. That is they don't know exactly what they should do next, but they do know they're not going to do again exactly what they just did. And that is a quick summary of those characteristics.

Now, one of the interesting things about this work is the thought that between 1978—August 1978—February 1981 I did divide my time between Harvard University in New York City and used this work as the substantive bases for programs of school improvement in the city of New York. Now, obviously it is—while these ideas were important to that effort, it matters a good deal that Chancellor Frank Macchiarola cared about them and that Chancellor Macchiarola had surrounded himself with men and women who, in my judgment, were committed to a single outcome and that was to make the New York schools better places for all of the million children who still go to school there.

To give you the outcome before I even mention the process of intervention, as of June 1981, the New York City schools are above the national average in their performance on standardized achievement tests and rising. And it is also true that the substantive intellectual bases for Chancellor Macchiarola's programs of school improvement and institutional redesign do derive from the body of work of which my own research is illustrative and that I'm glad to say that I had some significant part to play in that outcome.

In summarizing it I can also tell you, for example, that this research forms the basis for programs of school improvement in Milwaukee, Wis.; in St. Louis, Mo.; in a number of school districts in the State of Connecticut, and in a number of school districts in the State of New Jersey.

In the State of New Jersey it is interesting to me that the New Jersey Education Association is using this research as the basis for having designed a program of school improvement that the union makes available to its people on teacher demand. That is one does not ordinarily note union initiative in the direction of such direct instructional service to its constituents and I think it's interesting that they are doing that.

In any case, a good deal is going on. I think that there is reason for some cautious optimism about prospects for the future. I think it unfortunate that the public's increasing interest in and endorsement of these approaches to school effectiveness cannot be accompanied by a national rhetoric in both the Congress and the executive branch that endorses these initiatives and encourages these initiatives because obviously what's going on is that while the public and the school people on their own are engaged in what I regard as some fairly unusual behaviors in these programs of school improvement, it's also true that the Washington discourse on education seems to be moving in quite another direction.

I would, for example, endorse the remarks my predecessor made about making changes in title I, but quite frankly I don't know how optimistic I am about that because I'm rather more concerned about whether the Federal Government will stay in the education business at all. And I'll end this by telling you, at least in summary terms, why I think you should.

I think there's little doubt that in the years between the mid-sixties and the present which is the period of Federal participation in elementary-secondary education. There's little doubt that we have a good deal to show for that. We've a good deal to show in systematic evaluations of improvements and performance for low-income children. Furthermore, we can also tell you with some considerable specificity the circumstances under which title I programs are almost always instructional effective.

Now, but more importantly even than that—what the Federal Government has done for public schooling in the United States it has compelled both attention and resources be focused on precisely that portion of the school age population that has historically profited least from the way we do things. I mean if there has been a Federal triumph, it may be unsung. It may be too modest to receive the sort of attention it deserves. But if you want to note a triumph, I think it takes two forms. No. 1, I doubt that there's any Federal program that has been as successful than title I in seeing to it that congressionally allocated resources were in fact delivered to precisely those children for whom they were intended. That has been one of the extraordinary outcomes of title I.

But the second more notable outcome is not the Federal role in education has given local and State educational decision-makers the opportunity to avoid the politics of local decisionmaking would make it dramatically difficult for them to pay attention to that portion of their local and State constituency that is most politically impotent; has the least influence and the least opportunity to influence the way local and State boards operate. And on those grounds and in combination with these initiatives about school improvement, I certainly hope that the Congress stays in the education business and as a matter of fact if anything it gets greater instead of lesser. Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. The Chair would like to commend all three witnesses for the excellent presentations that they have made to the committee. The statements—the prepared statements in their entirety will be printed in the record as they were presented to the committee.

First, Dr. Rosenshine, may I ask you in the statement that you made—the prepared statement, on page 7, asks the question, Will the schools adopt the successful programs? And you indicated that they had not received wide acceptance and you had seemed to imply great doubt that they would be adopted. Could you explain why you think the schools or school districts are not inclined to adopt what may be cited as successful programs?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. That, I cannot give a very good answer. My primary work as a researcher is identifying what works—identifying successful practices, identifying successful programs. I'm not in administration. I'm not in a position to have—I haven't done any work on this problem.

One of the problems apparently is that what goes on these programs—this direct instruction, highly controlled structured environment is different from what the teachers were trained to do in their colleges of education. And so that—because years ago in colleges of education we didn't understand instruction and so we gave out nostrums—or they gave our nostrums like educate the whole child and each child learns differently. And I think the conflict between the—what I consider the misrules that were learned 10 or 15 years ago and what is coming out as effective education is one of the reasons as to why these things aren't being accepted.

Another reason is I think just simple competition. If school A down the road has put in this specific program then they're getting all the publicity and school B—there's no payoff for school B to simply imitate school A.

But I can't answer more on that.

Mr. HAWKINS. With respect to the point made by Ms. Bernstein, and I think to some extent referred to by Mr. Edmonds on the success of title I programs, did you in any way in the schools that you observed had any opportunity to observe the operation of title I programs? And if so, how did you evaluate them?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. Well, all schools that I observed were schools that were primarily serving poor children. Therefore these were all heavy title I programs.

Mr. HAWKINS. They were all effective schools?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. Those that I saw were all effective schools and because I——

Mr. HAWKINS. Would you say that the effectiveness of those schools was in any way related to the title I programs?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. I don't know. Is Follow Through—I don't know if the Follow Through program is directly under title I. But I do know that the Follow Through program was—has developed certain cites and programs that are quite effective. Now whether—I don't know if that's title I or not.

Mr. HAWKINS. Ms. Bernstein, you indicated or did criticize the title I program in a very definitive way. There's no doubt that you do not evaluate them very highly. And you indicated in the final paragraph that on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we should replace the low expectation with higher expectations and should reward success rather than codify failure. Could you simplify that for the committee. And what way then would we make changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that would accomplish what you believe to be more desirable than the emphasis that has been placed on title I programs?

Ms. BERNSTEIN. All right. Let me explain first of all to back—

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, how would you replace title I programs? That may be a better way to——

Ms. BERNSTEIN. Oh, OK. I still believe that the way the Federal Government awards title I funds is basically sound in the sense that the distribution is controlled as to the States. And as to the school districts within the States and as to the schools within the school district.

How I would change it is that once that money got to the level of the school, which by definition and by the operation of the formulas in the Federal and State formulas is almost by definition a low-income and minority school with educational problems. That once the money got to the schoolhouse, that there would not be this attempt to segregate the eligible children from the rest of the children in the schools.

Nearly all of those schools have high percentages of low-income and minority students. But that the title I staff would not be trained separately from the regular staff. That there would be—the Federal regulations would permit the training of the whole faculty to create this wholeness that Dr. Edmonds is referring to and which other researchers have found to be an important ingredient in the successful school.

That the kind of allowable expenditures would focus more on the changing of the concept of the school. The changing of the emphasis of the school rather than on focusing on the buyable things that are allowed to be purchased under the present title I regulations such as books and materials.

This is not to say that those schools don't need money. It is only to say that the way in which all of that got laid down in 1965 placed a heavy emphasis on the material and the purchasable rather than that which was the ideas that would transform a pedestrian school to a successful school. I think that the successful schools that people are identifying now are nearly all title I schools. But the question is why is it that one title I school is meeting the objectives and another one is not? What are these critical differences and those critical differences are the ones that Dr. Edmonds has explained.

I think that this effective school movement is almost independent of title I. It's not—and in some respects I think it's incompatible with the rules of title I in that title I does not promote a wholeness at the school level. Of whole school planning, a whole school supportive environment. It tends to divide the students and divide the faculty and to create tensions within the school rather than unity within a school.

Mr. HAWKINS. Would you say then that the Federal money that has been flowing to the school district under title I should be continued, but that its concentration should be upon the school rather than directed to a certain group of students within the school? Would you favor the continuation then of title I?

Ms. BERNSTEIN. Yeah, I'd like to see—I think these school districts need money. And they're going to need more money in the future. And I'd certainly like to see the Federal Government continue to assist school districts that have high concentrations of kids that have historically been difficult to teach. But I'd like to see the philosophical assumptions on which title I was drawn in 1965 reexamined by the Congress when it redesigns the program in the future.

The answer is yes. I think that money should keep flowing, but that there should——

Mr. HAWKINS. And should it go to the so-called disadvantaged schools—the schools where there is a concentration of disadvantaged students. You would agree up to that point?

Ms. BERNSTEIN. Right.

Mr. **Hawkins**. It's only the distribution of the money within the school itself among its students that you find a difference?

Ms. **Bernstein**. Where I take exception, that's right.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Edmonds, in what way do you answer the same general question with respect to a compensatory education as embodied in title I?

Mr. **Edmonds**. I think that the problem that some people note in title I has to do with its origin. Title I was born in the middle of the 1960's in response to what's called familial effects analysis or the origin of achievement. The prevailing explanation of achievement in the mid-sixties was still the Coleman report. The Coleman report allowed people to interpret the notion that if you wanted to cause children to do better in school, you didn't alter the school, you altered the children. And that's why the program was called compensatory education. It was designed to compensate these children for the differences that presumably prevented their doing better in school.

In my judgment the single stroke of the pen that could wipe out the familial effects origin of title I is to change eligibility from income to performance. That is to eliminate family characteristics as the measure of pupil eligibility for title I and substitute pupil performance on standardized measures of achievement.

What you would discover if you did that is that the eligible population would change hardly at all but the whole of this difficulty about the intellectual disability of familial effects and all of that would be wiped out at one stroke.

The other benefit that that would have is that it seems to me that if you then talked about pupil eligibility as a function of how well they're doing in school, then you get away from the politics of arguing that you're only interested in one portion of the population and presumably therefore less interested in the other portion of the population. And I think that then permits what the Federal Government itself has already concluded in its own studies are the three characteristics of title I when it's most consistently effective. No. 1, it's most effective when it occurs in the lower grades. No. 2, is most effective when it's characterized by tight administration and careful programing and No. 3, perhaps most importantly, it is most effective when it is not a pullout program. That is title I programs are most effective when their approach to remedial instruction is a whole group instruction in which supplementary materials and supplementary personnel operate under the direct administration of the local principal and the local classroom teacher. And these outside resources and these outside men and women are made to do the bidding of the local school and they are not free to work their will by taking these eligible children physically out of the room and they participate in a separate program with separate materials and separate measures of outcome and so forth and so on.

Let me just conclude that, Mr. Chairman, by saying that you asked my colleague earlier why weren't schools using what we now know of effective programing. I think that there are two—there are a number of answers, but I'll just give two very briefly.

The first answer is there is an intellectual explanation. The United States is still notable for the fact that its primary explanation for the origin of achievement is still a familial explanation. That is most Americans as do most social scientists still continue to conclude that how well children do in school is still far more a function of the nature of their family than the character of their school. And as long as that's true, then our school colleagues have a ready-made intellectually legitimate explanation for why they don't serve poor children better than they do.

The second reason is a political one. That is it does turn out, as I suspect we all know, that in the rigors of local political decisionmaking and State political decisionmaking the low-income family is the most potent. It is the least able to compel educators and other social servants to do what those families want done for them. And as we all know, social service is—as it ought I think to be a political exercise and the social servants serve those they think they must. And when they think they needn't then they don't. And since most low-income families are unable either to politically reward those who do their bidding or to politically punish those who don't, then local school people lack a political motivation for using the advances and research on effective schools being talked about here.

That's one of my reasons for wanting the Federal Government to remain in the picture because the Federal Government dissipates that limitation on what is otherwise the genius of American political decisionmaking at the local level.

Mr. Hawkins. Thank you, Mr. Edmonds. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. Goodling. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Edmonds, I think, Follow Through after the 1978 amendments became a special project rather than a title I.

Mr. Edmonds. It did that.

Mr. Goodling. It's an interesting situation because many of the creative administrators and educational leaders, of course, were involved in Follow Through before the Congress decided they should be in Follow Through. And we are now asking them to pay back the money that they spent. In many instances ESEA title I, because they were creative and ahead of their time or ahead of Congress time I should say.

The importance of the leadership in the school has been mentioned. But, I discovered in supervising student teachers that sometimes in spite of good leadership in the school, the teaching staff was so poor that they had a difficult time leading toward excellence. Did you discover that in your studies?

Mr. Edmonds. I'll give mine first because it's pretty short. Our conclusion was that effective leadership was unnecessary but by no means sufficient prerequisite to school effectiveness. And that we never found an ineffective school that didn't have effective leadership, but we did find ineffective schools with otherwise exemplary principals. And that it clearly to us was because some of the other critical institutional characteristics weren't present to reinforce what the leader was able to offer.

Mr. Goodling. Does anyone else wish to respond?

Dr. Rosenshine. Suppose we have a less effective teacher. What can we do for her or him? We can say be a professional. We can say be concerned. We can say teach the whole child. I would hope that we can give them specific training programs that they can use. And these things are emerging now. They're emerging out of the educational literature, out of the educational research. Some of the Follow Through programs I've seen in some of these Follow Through or some of the other teacher-training programs, teachers who are apparently burned out, who got into these specific programs and got all fired up. I know of research where we have taken teachers in urban settings and where the children were achieving low, gave them these instructions about teaching, the teachers used them and the achievement scores went up.

Such has been one experiment that Tom Good did in Tulsa, Okla., which was recently replicated in Milwaukee, Wis. So, It's an issue of what do we have to give the teachers rather than say OK, go out and locate materials somewhere. And I would hope that—I don't know how one does target, that we would target it more toward the validated proven materials. At this point we do have validated proven approaches. And I think it's unfortunate that the schools are told no one thing works the same for all children and go out and find the material that you think are appropriate when they frequently choose inappropriate material.

Mr. GOODLING. That is true particularly when they're talking to the least effective teachers who would have a very difficult time finding material. There are a lot who probably could go out and find good material. But there are a lot, particularly, I always felt, from the post-World War II baby boom era who could not. I had to hire an awful lot of breathing people. That's the best I could say for them, but they got on tenure and it was a problem.

Dr. ROSENSHINE. But I know in one case where we passed out these teacher-training instructions to teachers and the teachers turned around and said how come we never saw this before.

Mr. GOODLING. Teacher expectation was mentioned. Is there a danger that we could go to the other extreme and undo all that you saw as happening partially because of teacher expectation?

Mr. EDMONDS. I'm not sure I understand.

Mr. GOODLING. I've had experience with teachers who had a tendency to over-expect and seemed to be rather devastating in relationship to the youngsters you're talking about.

Mr. EDMONDS. Well, let me tell you—at least from my point of view what I would regard as an unrealistic expectation and what I would regard as a realistic expectation. I do not think at the present moment it is realistic to expect schools to eliminate the educational advantage of being middle class.

I do not think it realistic to believe that low-income children as a group can be taught in ways that will make them as academically successful as middle-class children as a group. I mean one of the advantages of being middle class is that you learn to learn in ways that schools prefer to teach. And I don't even object to that middle-class advantage. So, that I think those of us who pay attention to this phenomenon of the gap, I do expect it to remain. And so, if you set out to eliminate it I think you're going to be disappointed.

I do think it, however, highly realistic—I mean my remark is not meant to suggest that they are not individual low-income children who outperform everybody. Who out perform middle-class children as a group and low-income children as a group. That continues to happen with individual low-income children.

But then talking about what is realistic—what is realistic is the straightforward notion that if we can agree on the body of knowledge and sets of skills that describe mastery for any grade we choose to discuss, it is highly realistic to expect something like 99.5 percent of the school-age population to master that. That is a highly realistic expectation. And therefore, I mean in some respects, obviously we could talk about expectations in ways that would cause people to be grievously disappointed. But I don't think that the description I'm giving subjects our teacher colleagues to such an unreasonable measure of outcome.

Mr. Goodling. Two other quick questions. What role do you see the highly organized collective-bargaining system playing, particularly as we speak of effective leadership within the school? Did that negate effective leadership in some instances? Or did it make it more difficult?

Mr. Edmonds. I'll make two quick responses to that. One is one of the differences between effective principals and ineffective principals is that effective principals find ways to use the union contract to their own school advantage. And they are not struck either dumb or unable to move in consequence of having to work with the union contract. So, I don't see it as a insurmountable obstacle to effective leadership. That's one.

But I will tell you what is, in my judgment, a very serious problem. We are not going to make advances on a reasonable basis for dismissing incompetent teachers until local school districts—particularly in a school district like New York, have a greater local opportunity to use their systematic and defensible evaluation of teacher performance as a basis for whether or not to dismiss teachers. At the moment the politics of the design for tenure review and the State role in any effort in the local school district to dismiss a teacher even for the most unambiguous cause in my view, represents an unreasonable obstacle to the full exercise of local educational authority. And I say that to you that way because I do not regard that as a problem of pedagogy or social science. It is a political problem. It derives from the fact we have found ourselves in some school districts in circumstances in which there is a clear unbalance in the political authority of the local board of education as contrasted to the teacher representatives and I think that some political attention needs to be paid to that. And that we're not going to make progress on that one because we make advances in the research on the school effectiveness.

And I do not mean in saying that to say that I am in opposition to teacher unions. Far from it, I am a strong advocate. My interaction with the United Federation of Teachers in New York City was cooperative and while it was not altogether sweetness and light, we worked together and we did things well. But I say to you what I said to them. I do think that the New York City Board of Education cannot approach the political authority of the United Federation of Teachers in discussions of teacher dismissal and I think that is a redress and that it is in the best interest of the public interest that some advance be made on that front.

Mr. Goodling. I have one last question that all three of you may want to respond to. I'm afraid this whole tax credit issue, of course, is before us or will be before us. Could I have your reaction in relationship to urban education and the tax credit issue? Or, doesn't anyone want to touch that?

Ms. **Bernstein**. They're looking at me for some reason. Maybe they don't want to answer. My organization does not have a position on that issue. But we will observe, however, that there's an awful lot of not very elevating arguments being made on both sides of this issue. It seems to me to be a measure or a move which is a predictable response to the anxiety that the American people feel about the decline of the schools. But it seems to me not to be straight forwardly headed in the direction of excellence. It seems to me more—that the minds of the people who support the concept of tuition tax credit is more along the lines of triage. We will save those who are motivated and we will forget about the rest. It seems to me that that is it's likely outcome. I don't really see how——

Mr. **Goodling**. That's my major concern about the whole issue.

Mr. **Edmonds**. Well, my position on that would be that the American experiment in mass public education is the most successful of it's kind in recorded history. I mean we don't even have any near seconds in that regard. That is no group of people have been as successful as American educators in demonstrating the educability of any portion of the population to which you choose to pay attention.

The difficulty in our limitation in the American system of mass public education and the circumstances that have prevented us from applying what we know of those solutions to all of the settings that need them, I regard that as the major obstacle to the advance of educational equity in the United States.

To enact tax credits will virtually preclude our making those kinds of advances because if the preponderance of low income and minority children in the United States have prospects for the educational future it is because of the fact that the most successful settings for serving such children exist in American cities. Anything that dissipates the power and authority of public schools in American cities to get on with the business at hand. And as I think the tax credit would do, is going to make even less likely the fact that we will extend what we now know of effective schooling to precisely that portion of the population that is in most need of that.

And there's nothing I know about the advance in tax credits or the proliferation of private schools that would accrue to the ultimate benefits of the masses of children that we are still responsible for schooling in American cities.

Mr. **Goodling**. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd first of all like to welcome Mr. Ronald Edmonds from Michigan State University to the hearing this morning. I found all the testimony excellent and picked up some very good ideas. I'm in real life a schoolteacher.

When I was in the Michigan legislature, I was one of the authors of chapter 3, the State of Michigan program which supplements title I. I feel that it is a very important program. I think Ms. Bernstein and Mr. Edmonds agree that it is an effective program despite whatever differences you might or might not have as to how much flexibility should be allowed within a school building.

My question is very simple and it's pointed and probably leading. How do you feel the Congress should react to President Reagan's recommendation that the title I funding be dropped from what was last year $3.1 to $2.47 billion? I've been trying to ask school districts throughout the country about what percentage of their Federal dollars is title I. And it's been running roughly one-third to one-half.

Would any of you care to comment on the effect of that cut in Title 1?

Mr. EDMONDS. For my part one of the great problems in title I and in chapter 3 has been the fact that neither has ever been able to be fully funded for 100 percent of the eligible population. Title I at its height was only subsidizing about 66 percent of the legally eligible title I population.

Now, the problem that is represented in title I has been that the administrative rules and regulations on title I have said children who are farthest away from the norm are suppose to be funded first. So, the proportion of the title I eligible population that isn't funded are precisely those children who are already closest to the standard we want them to meet. But they're ineligible for title I funding because, you know, in the name of equity we've argued that we ought to help the kids that have fallen the farthest behind. The irony is though that the kids that we don't fund get farther and farther behind and then eventually they do become eligible for title I and by that time they're a devil of a lot more difficult to help than they would have been if we'd funded them in the first place.

Therefore I think that it is a very very serious error to diminish the title I appropriation at all precisely because of this business of saying that one of the things that would really have advanced title I all along would have been to fund it in a way that made 100 percent of the eligible population able to participate.

So, I hope that does not go forward in that way.

Mr. KILDEE. The House so far has not gone alone with that.

Mr. EDMONDS. Right.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Natcher has kept the higher appropriation.

Ms. BERNSTEIN. One thing that does seem to be happening, Mr. Kildee, is that the States and localities are imitating the Federal Government in the sense that they're passing on responsibilities to the lower—next lowest level of government without passing on the money. And you know, cuts are being made. Block granting is happening in some States.

It seems to me a substantial cut in title I funds at this time would really devastate some school districts who are already losing because of inflation, losing because of declining enrollment, losing because of cuts in the State foundation program, losing because of Federal cuts. So, that a substantial upset in the Federal allocation for title I would, although I'd prefer to see it allocated on a different philosophical base, but I'd rather—but they can't run schools on air. They've got to have money for running the schools and a school district that relies heavily on title I that would be a substantial blow and might even cause the closing of schools in some school districts, as we're already seeing.

Mr. KILDEE. In Michigan, as a matter of fact, right now two school districts have closed down. I can't believe that in my State. I chaired the educational finance subcommittee in the Michigan House. I say that with somewhat of an apology. I use to have to distribute the inadequate education dollars as equitably as possible when I was in charge. Right now I don't know how Michigan can fund our supplementary chapter 3 program let alone take the cut in Federal dollars for title I.

In Michigan? I'm afraid to look at results out there.

Mr. GOODLING. You must be afraid to go home?

Dr. ROSENSHINE. There's a couple of things I've noticed about successful programs. These are national successful programs. One of them is that they have a full-time teacher supervisor in the school district. This takes away the idea of it coming from the outside. This teacher supervisor I've seen walks around from classroom to classroom helping the teachers, aiding the teachers and training the new teachers as they come in this program.

A second thing that these successful programs frequently have is teacher aids because the poor kids need time and they work better when they're working with the teacher helping them.

Now, when the money is cut back two things that go very quickly are that supervisor and those aids. And then frequently you can have a successful program that gets hurt and the kids fall back when that supervisor isn't there to help train the new teachers and the aids aren't there for the kids.

Mr. KILDEE. All right, thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Petri?

Mr. PETRI. I'd just like to thank the panel for what I found very exciting testimony and I'm curious if you could provide any greater guidance on changes that we should be making in legislation based on what it is that you've found. You were quite critical—or at least I understood you to be quite critical as to the way title I is currently structured and a suggestion was made that perhaps we go to some sort of a test as a basis for dispensing the funds. How would that work exactly? Really? Would that be of children coming into school? Otherwise they would be an incentive for kids to do poorly on tests even if they did very well the rest of the time. How are you going to do that sort of thing? Would that be to the school district then or to a particular school so we would have in affect a block grant to each school and then it would be up to the administrator? Would there be guidelines to prevent the local people from dickering around their local taxpayer base to compensate for the fact that some school was getting more title I money? We'd have to keep an eye on some things like that, I would suppose.

Could you flush out that idea a little bit because I think we're going to be eager to improve things like title I, but as you know, there are interests that are—it's written the way it is now because it reflects a lot of different dynamics in the education community.

Mr. EDMONDS. Well, it's interesting that one of the solutions to the funding problem is in Mr. Kildee's reference to chapter 3. One of the innovations that chapter 3 made was to take the position that when students were eligible for Michigan subsidy by virtue of low performance, that district subsidy would be for at least 3 consecutive years. The reason for that is so that if in the first year of educational intervention, you brought the student up to or above the standard you were interested in, you didn't immediately get penalized and loose your funding.

If you did that, then it seems to me that you would then clearly be rewarding improvement as contrasted to rewarding failure. But the other thing is that I don't think that any local school district is going to be able to politically survive if the record shows that it is making some inordinate proportion of it's population eligible for anybody's subsidy because it seems to me we've long since learned by now that local people are not going to tolerate giving increasing sums of money to educators who are not professionally responsible in what they do with it.

So, I think there are formulas for distribution and eligibility that can solve the problem and then other circumstances that can prevent its abuse.

You know several years ago the House, on it's own initiative did have very serious discussions about substituting standardized tests as the basis for title I instead of family characteristics. And at the time NIE's evaluation was that since we have so little in the way of standardized testing that that was going to be an inordinate burden and unworkable and so forth and so on.

I think two things have happened since then to make that a responsible prospect. It does not in fact require a Federal program. No. 1, an increasing number of States have very psychometrically defensible State programs of assessment that the Federal Government could use for purposes of doing this evaluation.

No. 2, even those States that don't have it, since it is a desirable program by any measure, could be encouraged by this kind of Federal initiative in adopting a State program of assessment and the difficulties of measurement and comparability and the like are not so great as to require every State to imitate every other State. But the technology of this advance. I mean if you look for example, at the history of the Michigan educational assessment program which is now 10 years old, you know, that our ability to more economically, more sensibly, and more defensibly to go forward with that kind of a program, makes prospects for using achievement as the basis for title I eligibility better than it has ever been before.

Mr. Petri. Would you structure it so it would have aid based on a curve so to speak? Or a cutoff point and—and concentrated—if 30 percent of the pupils fell below some guideline or would you give some to every school because every school is naturally probably going to have a few kids——

Mr. Edmonds. Well, first—I think if you look at it now. I mean look now at the distribution of title I funds and what I'm predicting. I mean actually you could do a preliminary inquiry and ask the question.

What I'm predicting is that if you shifted at this moment from income eligibility to achievement eligibility you would virtually not effect the distribution of title I funds at all. But to answer more explicitly your question, I would still take the position that any school district having a significant 5 percent; some arbitrary cutoff. any significant proportion of the population in any of its local schools that was failing to meet a certain agreed upon normative standard of mastery, ought to be eligible for that kind of subsidy.

Mr. Kildee. Would the gentleman yield on that point? Mr. Edmonds you suggested a change from testing to poverty charactertistics—

Mr. Edmonds. No, the other way around.

Mr. Kildee. Yes. That is what I meant to say. The change from income-level characteristics to testing characteristics would not significantly change the distribution of the dollars. Does that mean it would not really change the student body served by those dollars?

Mr. Edmonds. Right.

Mr. Kildee. You're serving basically the same students?

Mr. Edmonds. That's correct. But your rationale for doing it, would be different.

Mr. Kildee. Right. I just want to clarify that point. Thank you very much.

Mr. Petri. Well, that is a point of contention though because I—you don't want—there was other testimony you don't want to pullout or segregate students in the schools. You want to leave it up to the schools and you want to try to have them—have education proceed on a——

Mr. Edmonds. Well, that's still just a contest between pullout versus whole instruction. But I mean the rules and regulation on title I could still say when a school building is eligible for title I, the Federal Government's preferred approach to instruction is an integrated approach to instruction as contrasted to pullout.

The NIE evaluation of title I, which was finished I guess about 3 years ago, came down very, very hard. I mean even under present circumstances NIE came down very hard on the argument that whether you changed eligibility or not, the title I program should cease its encouragement of pullout programs because the record is unambiguous in condemning them as—as instructionally affected.

Mr. Petri. Just one last question and an open ended one if I give you a chance to respond to this as well. And that is that are there any other things besides these changes in title I that we might do to nudge or encourage schools in the direction that these studies seem to be pointing us? That we won't end up making things worse by——

Ms. Bernstein. Right. Well, I'd like to——

Mr. Petri. It's very easy to have the best of intentions and then end up with——

Ms. Bernstein. I'd like to mention that—that we have through these research studies of successful schools there are now a list of characteristics that you can look at as to the characteristic of a principal of a successful school. The characteristic of the faculty and characteristic of the program. And the whole dimension of expectancy. But we don't really know very much about how to create that in a situation where it does not naturally exist.

In other words I've been looking around trying to find out if they're any school districts that are modeling their recruitment selection training and evaluation of principals on the school-effectiveness principles. I haven't been able to locate any place where that seems to be done in a systematic way.

There are efforts underway around the country to systematize the selection of principals and make it more scientific. But it doesn't seem to correlate with the knowledge from the school-effectiveness research.

The Federal Government could help do that. A school district can't really do that by itself with its own funds. We could help define what constitutes a—how do you know when you've got a principal that has an academic focus. How do you know what the principal's role is in assuring time on task and how can you tell in advance before you've made somebody a principal whether they're going to be the kind of person who can do that.

Again looking at expectancy we don't—most people if you ask them do you expect children to learn, they're going to say of course I expect children to learn. There's a big difference between people who really expect children to learn and people who only think that they expect children to learn. And we don't have very much information about how you look at that dimension and how you know when you've got it. And how you create it if you don't have it. So the Federal Government certainly could sponsor through NIE a lot of research on how to flush out and realize these findings from the school-effectiveness research because they really are in their infancy now. I think that would be an important contribution.

Mr. PETRI. It would seem to be an administrative rather than a programmatic thing as much as anything. Are there training schools or refresher courses for superintendents of instruction or something that we could—I mean what you want to do is get the guy in charge and have him fully understand this and then it filters down through the whole system because of the nature of people who are promoted and hired to be principals and it's a leadership—it's not us writing laws and handing out money as much as it is people and how they organize their schools.

Ms. BERNSTEIN. I think big beefing up of the national diffusion network along these lines would probably be helpful. And some research—scholarly contribution which the Federal Government alone seems to have the critical mass of resources to do. And looking at all of these dimensions of successful schooling and providing more specific operational information about how a school district that wants to move in that direction can do so with reasonable security that what they're doing is going to be effective.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Petri, two things there. No. 1, I'm going to ask Mr. Hawkins' permission to send to Mr. Smith a paper of mine that is a rather more explicit evaluation of title I and summarizes a good many of the points I was trying to make because it is—I mean this paper here was an attempt to summarize the research that we've all been talking about. And I would like the—permission to send to Mr. Smith a paper that is—that gets at a good deal of this discussion about title I in a much more direct way.

For example one of the things I was going to add—there are two things that title I can do that encourages everything we've been talking about. One is title I does not now permit the rollover of its allocation which is a problem because it makes long-term use of those resources and careful planning with respect to those resources. Very difficult. They have to be expended in the year in which they are assigned. That causes some serious problems, but in my judgment the key to the whole of this discourse is the role evaluation plays in educational decisionmaking.

Before I would encourage the Federal Government to pay any legislative attention to leadership and expectations and matters of that kind, it seems to me that the one thing the Federal Government can pay substantial attention to is its encouraging of the use of evaluation in educational decisionmaking. That's a far less controversial, difficult potentially troublesome thing to do. And I—and say you raise the issue of our offering training programs and the like for educators and decisionmakers and so on. One of the reasons I moved from Harvard University to Michigan State University was to join the NIE funded Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State which is one of the premier places in the country for studying this sort of thing we're talking about. And one of my major assignments at the university is to organize, in the first instance for Michigan educators but in the second instance for all interested parties programs, that orient superintendents and deputy superintendents and the like to what this research is about, what is the relationship between school effects research and teacher effects research and what can we explicitly offer superintendents of schools in the State of Michigan and elsewhere and their instructional leaders that allows them to take advantage of this advance in the state of the art. And I assure you that in the State of Michigan superintendent endorsement of this approach and superintendent eagerness to participate in it is virtually unanimous.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Without objection, the paper referred to by Mr. Edmonds will be entered into the record at this point.

[The information referred to by Ronald Edmonds follows:]

[From Social Policy, September/October 1981]

MAKING PUBLIC SCHOOLS EFFECTIVE

(By Ronald R. Edmonds)

The Reagan Administration and its Congressional allies are determined to reduce federal support for public shooling in general and compensatory education programs in particular. Prompted by fiscal-austerity priorities and a clearly diminished concern for the poor children who are the major beneficiaries of compensatory education, neither the Administration nor Congress recognizes the significance of the educational programs they are so eager to destroy. It behooves us, then, to look closely at what is to be sacrificed, for example, with the crippling of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—both in terms of its current merits and its potential as an instrument of compensation for social, economic, and educational disadvantage.

Recall "The War on Poverty" and the compensatory education programs that were intrinsic to it. Since they began in the mid-1960s, we have experienced an absolute decline in poverty, together with considerable improvement in the quantity and quality of schooling available to low-income Americans. These gains in education and income have been most especially notable for low-income white Americans and least notable for low-income Black Americans. The gains made should be sustained and extended to include a greater proportion of the latter.

Begun in 1965 in concert with federal initiatives in civil rights and desegregation, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was intended by the Congress to extend a broad range of services to low-income and minority-group schoolchildren. And yet it remains true that Blacks, the largest minority in the American elementary and secondary schools, are less effectively served than the white majority whose children are enrolled in proportionately fewer numbers in public schools.

According to the "National Assessment of Educational Progress," the source of our most comprehensive longitudinal measures of pupil performance, aggregate Black performance (at ages nine, 13, 17) ranges between ten and 17 points below the national mean in reading and math, while aggregate white performance ranges between two and three points above the mean.

An even more telling summary of pupil performance is the dropout rate for public schools across the nation. Among Black students of secondary school age, almost 20 percent fail to graduate, while for whites the comparable figure is 12.4 percent. Among the large-city systems the aggregate Black dropout rate stands dangerously near 50 percent, which means that mere statistics cannot convey the desperate educational constriants on inner-city minority youth. It is reasonable to suppose that inadequate academic preparation is a primary explanation for the decision not to finish school. While there may, of course, be other causes, school-performance data make the imperative for school responsibility quite clear.

Most American children begin school with above-minimum primary requisites, but by the third and fourth grade poor and minority children as a group begin to fall behind to the point that in big cities a high school diploma goes to only one of every two ninth graders. Seen in this perspective. Title I's overwhelming emphasis on academic achievement has been a powerful resource—leading to unprecedented, though still far from satisfactory, gains in school performance by disadvantaged Black students during the last 15 years. In the absence of Title 1, the dimensions of our educational failure would be dramatically greater.

TITLE I

Title I is most effective in redistributing scarce resources. Title I aid per pupil is approximately fives times as great in low-income school districts as in high-income areas. In fact, among the poorest school districts. Title I support approximates 30 percent of the total district budget even though Title I is only 3 percent of the national K-12 educational expenditure. Excepting only that the Title I per pupil allocation is tied to the state allocation, the average per pupil expenditure Title I funds go to the most needy and in the greatest amounts to those districts that have the greatest concentrations of low-income children. The Title I allocation is greatest for those cities whose states include high per pupil expenditure in subsurban school disctricts. This is because the Title I district allocation rises and falls as a function of average statewide per pupil expenditure.

Despite these fluctuations in Title I's per pupil allocation, it is still true that Title I serves only 66 percent of eligible students. The Congressional allocation is not sufficient to serve a full 100 percent.

Eligibility begins with pupil family income as measured by a weighted formula that combines family AFDC eligibility and free-lunch eligibility. These data determine the amount of Title I monies that are sent to a school. After the funds arrive at the school, their in-school distribution depends on the levels of pupil achievement. Only pupils well below the district achievement norm are served by Title I funds. Modification of this limit could lead to much greater Title I efficacy since, at present, students least likely to be served by Title I are often precisely those students most likely to profit from it. Low-income children whose achievement is only slightly below the acceptable norm are denied Title I service, although such children if served would be most likely to rise to and above the norm. In the absence of any program of educational treatment, children who were marginal in their early years of schooling slip farther and farther behind, eventually becoming eligible for Title I. By the time such eligibility occurs, these students constitute some of the most difficult and intractable instructional problems faced by compensatory-education instructional strategies.

Longitudinal evaluative Title I data consistently demonstrate the instructional efficacy of Title I when three conditions are present.

First, Title I programs are most likely to be effective in the early grades. Second, these programs are most likely to be effective when carefully organized and well administered. Finally, they are most likely to be effective when they do not use "pull out" programs that substitute for inclass instruction.

Furthermore, children participating in Title I programs that meet these three conditions consistently tend to show math and reading gains of at least one month for each month in the program. Children showing these gains do not lose them over the summer.

In sum, Title I is an instructionally effective program for eligible and needful children when organized and administered appropriately. Most instructional activities supported by Title I are consistent with prevailing practice in school districts throughout the United States. Title I is neither especially inventive nor is it experimental. Achievement variations across programs tend to be more a function of organization and administration than a function of differences in program materials or instructional strategy.

MAKING TITLE I WORK BETTER

Instead of moving to deny more children access to Title I opportunities, Congress should be planning how to make it an even greater instrument of educational improvement. A first step in this would be to alter the Title I funding formula so that per pupil Title I support does not rise and fall as a function of average statewide per pupil expenditure. As things now stand, poor children attending school in states with low per pupil expenditure are doubly penalized. First, such children are penalized because statewise support for their schooling is below national norms. Then they are further penalized by the failure of the Title I support for which they are eligible to rise to levels of support in other states. Since all other financial aspects of Title I have a predistributive effect that favors poor children, it seems needlessly contradictory to have the statewide average per pupil expenditure partially undo other deliberate financial effects of Title I.

Next, Congress should alter Title I eligibility to remove family income and social class as relevant variables in assessing pupil eligibility. Title I's major limitation as an instrument of instructional reform comes from the use of family characteristics as the major determinants of pupil eligibility.

This preoccupation with family background derives from, and reinforces, the "familial effects" analysis of the interaction between pupil performance and family background. Such analysis concludes that a child's level of achievement depends principally on the nature of the family from which the child comes. Consistent with such analysis is the fact that most Title I compensatory programs concentrate on altering children in ways that will teach them to learn in conformity with the school's preferred method of teaching.

The problem with this approach is its failure to accept the possibility that pupil performance depends more on the character of the school than on the nature of the family. For so long as Title I eligibility derives from family background, Title I programs must imply that pupil disability is due to some familial limitation as opposed to an inadequacy on the part of the school. As a result, Title I, as it stands, fails to influence school life in ways appropriate to actual pupil needs. Much better simply to make pupil progress, as measured by standardized achievements tests, the sole criterion for eligibility. Members of the House of Representatives proposed consideration of such a change as long ago as 1974, but NIE has consistently argued that the absence of a national testing program makes this proposal impractical.

However, since Title I should be strengthened by abandoning family background eligibility criteria, it makes sense to accept a state-by-state testing program. The costs, whether borne by the state or federal government, are not dramatic. The change in Title I allocations would not be great, but minority children would be certain beneficiaries.

Further reform of Title I requires the guarantee that disparte instructional activities not consistent with the school's summary purposes be excluded. Title I programs should conform to the school's mission, and should remain subject to the administrative and instructional personnel in the school. The effectiveness of administrative instructional leadership is a fundamental ingredient in school success, and Title I programs should reinformce and reflect it.

Finally, the ironic flaw in the Title I situation (that academic progress for low-income children can jeopardize a district's allocation) should be rectified. All Title I legislation, together with its administrative rules and regulations, should be reviewed to permit Title I support for improving students to continue for at least two years following the initial year of improvement. Clearly, such changes would have to be accompanied by funding formulae that did not prompt districts to support grievously deficient students while ignoring those of slight or marginal deficiency.

The most efficient way to solve this problem is to fund Title I at the level that would support service for 100 percent of Title I eligible students. A reduction in Title I funding will exagerate the problem of failure to serve students who, with only modest service, could meet the exceed national standards of skills mastery.

In the same vein some rollover of a district's Title I allocation should be permitted. The rollover would permit funds not spent in one year to be spent in the following year. Under present Title I rules, districts do not have permission to retain unexpected Title I funds from one year to the next. The absence of such permission discourages frugality and some districts procedures an orgy of Title I expenditure as the funding cycle draws to an end.

SCHOOLS DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Overall, the Title I experience proves the point that public schools can be much more effective in transmitting basic academic skils than they usually are. Evidence from particular program efforts confirms this conclusion. In an earlier article in this magazine (March/April 1979), I discussed a number of such program efforts, along with the studies of Weber, Madden, Brookover, Lezotte, and others that have carefully identified some of the more critical aspects of the effective school. I wish now, through reference to my own work, to further illuminate the proposition that pupil acquisition of basic school skills primarily depends more on the nature of the school to which the children are sent than on the character of the families from which they come.

In 1974 my colleagues and I began a research project at Harvard that collected income, social-class, and family background data on children in elementary and intermediate schools in a number of urban districts throughout the United States. We followed our collection of income and social-class data by collecting achievement data for the same children especially for grades three through seven.

We analyzed the data in search of schools that had gone far toward abolishing the all too predictable relationship between performance and family background. Such a school had to deliver basic school skills to a full range of its pupil population.

Our analysis of school effectiveness followed two steps. We first used our data on social class to assign each student to one of five social-class subsets. Once having established, with great specificity, how many children in each grade were poor, middle class, and so on across the five social-class subsets, we used our data on achievement to analyze the interaction between pupil performance and pupil social class. By this means we found a number of elementary and intermediate schools that were academically effective with the full range of their pupil population.

Having identified these schools, we set about to determine what else distinguished them from less successful schools. We maintained sufficient controls to be certain that if we did identify institutional differences it would be those institutional and organizational characteristics that accounted for the variation in achievement from school to school. There was, then, insufficient variation in the character of the pupil populations, the neighborhoods, or the circumstances under which the schools functioned to explain away dramatic achievement differences.

Next, we paired the effective schools with ineffective schools and assigned observers to each of the pairs. The observers recorded various aspects of school life, with written instruments we designed for that purpose, and sent us the data. We then analyzed the descriptions of school life to see whether any set of characteristics consistently described the effective schools as contrasted with those that were ineffective. We concluded that five institutional organizational characteristics consistently were evident in the effective schools and were absent in whole or in part in the ineffective schools: the style of leadership in the building; the instructional emphasis in the building; the climate of the school; the implied expectations derived from the teacher's behavior in the classroom; and finally the presence, use, and response to standardized instruments for measuring pupil progress.

These five characteristics are much more than research findings. Indeed, they are, in fact, the basis of an instructional reform agenda that has been the guiding principle of New York City's "School Improvement Project." In its effort to translate educaional research findings into day-to-day professional educator behavior, the poject has pioneered a new pedagogical context for the implementation of Title I imperative and opportunity. Together they present a formidable force for school improvement. The research, the know-how, and the funds are essential.

Our work was guided by three premises: first, that all the children in the New York City public schools are educable; second, that the educability of the children derives far more from the nature of the school to which they are sent than from the nature of the family from which they come; and third, and perhaps most important, that pupil acquisition of basic school skills is not determined by family background. It is the school response to family background that determines pupil performance.

Two points should be emphisized here. First, these references to pupil performance refer to math and reading skills as measured by pupil performance on standardized achievement tests. Such tests are, of course, only a basis for evaluating a school's minimum obligation. The emphasis on these minimum obligations must not be taken to mean that the loftier purposes of education are served by such a standard. The focus on measurable minimums is merely meant to assert that school effectiveness precedes educational excellence. A second major point to be emphasized is that effective schools are not necessarily characterized by identical levels of achievement for the social-class subsets present in most urban schools.

My standard of effectiveness merely requires that the proportion of poor children achieving minimum mastery approximate the proportion of middle-class children achieving minimum mastery. As a group, middle-class children may still outperform poor children as a group, but no significant proportion of either group in an effective school will fail to obtain the prerequisites to successful access to the next level of schooling.

Evaluation of existing school practices was basic to the School Improvement Project. School liaisons were trained and assigned to the participating schools. Their job is to guide the administrative and instructional personnel of the schools through an evaluation of the school's relative strength and weakness with respect to each of the characteristics above. The outcome of that examination is what we call the Needs Assessment Document. These documents have been prepared primarily by the liaison people but in close collaboration with a representative group that has been convened in each school.

Each document talks with some specificity about the relative strength and weakness of the instructional leadership in the building, the instructional emphasis of the building, the climate of the building, and so on. These documents are then used as a basis for making decisions about what kind of technical assistance would bring the school the characteristics we wanted it to have. Bear in mind that the premise from which all this proceeds is that any school that has obtained the five characteristics all at once would begin to show improvement in skills acquisition for precisely that portion of the pupil population that ordinarily profits least from the way we approach teaching and learning in city schools.

For example, if the needs assessment finds the school principal wanting in some aspect of instructional leadership, then the question is put: "What might be done to improve that principal's skills in the exercise of instructional leadership?" One of our very firm conclusions is that the principal of the school has to be the person to whom the instructional personnel look for instructional leadership. We know that one of the measures of instructional leadership is that the principal has to visit classes, systematically observe, and respond to the observations. Therefore, if we discovered that the principal seldom does that, we would respond by assigning a person to work with the principal to teach what he or she might need to know in order to be a sophisticated and consistent evaluator of teacher performance in the classroom. If the needs assessment shows that the teachers are insecure about their use of achievement data, we might assign to the school a professor of measurement and say that we wanted the teachers to participate in seminars on interpreting assessment data or evaluating achievement outcomes. Or we might assign a curriculum person if we wanted teachers better trained in how one uses achievement data as a basis for program design.

The point I'm trying to make is that this process of intervention does not alter per pupil expenditure, does not add in any permanent way to the resources with which the school works, does not reduce class size, and does not add to the repertoire of services that the school has to offer. The project merely sets out to help the school staff see that there are ways to make better use of the resources already in the school.

The results have been both dramatic and unambiguous. Pupil performance on city-wide, nationally normed, standardized tests of math and reading have dramatically improved each school year since 1978. By the spring of 1981, tests showed an aggregate performance in the New York City public schools above the national norms.

The summary point of this article is that an understanding of school effectiveness, when applied to educational resources like Title I, produces dramatic gains in teaching and learning. Other school systems are beginning to follow New York City's example; educational research findings on the characteristics of effective schools hold great promise for more effective school practices. But without the resources and services supported by Title I, the gains in school effectiveness could not have occurred. New York City's now high rating in school achievement is a dramatic example of what poor children stand to lose if Mr. Reagan succeeds in his proposed reductions in educational spending.

Mr. EDMONDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. ROSENSHINE. May I answer?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, Dr. Rosenshine.

Dr. ROSENSHINE. A couple of things about the Federal role. One is I would certainly endorse the encouragement that more money be allocated to encourage research on instruction. We can't train the principals and the superintendents in instruction until we understand it. We're starting to understand it and the funded projects are aiding in this. We don't really know how to teach reading. We don't really know how to teach math. We don't really know how to teach reading comprehension.

We're starting with our research on instruction, and with some of the research on learning and cognitive psychology and information processes. Some of which is going on at Illinois in our federally funded Center for Study of Reading. Out of this is going to come a technology for instruction, and the continued research on this to me seems extremely important. Research on learning and instruction.

Second, and I'm not sure of the political advisability on this, but as I look at it, what would I do? We have the national diffusion network in the Department of Education which has listed validated programs. By validated programs, they mean these programs have demonstrated sufficiently to the panel that these programs have obtained achievement gain for frequently urban poor title I kids.

I don't know why—and every program that I've seen that I'm encouraging is on that list, has made it to the validated list. What if one said you can only use programs that come from the NDN, National Diffusion Network validated list. That those are the ones that are going to be eligible for funding and not anything—and not anything else.

Mr. **Edmonds**. Mr. Chairman, may I just——

Mr. **Hawkins**. Yes, Mr. Edmonds.

Mr. **Edmonds**. While there is a considerable merit in that, and I can understand why my colleague would make that remark, I hope you don't do that. I mean the trade-off is just too great. I mean I think that it is true that, you know, all of us are at some level critical of local practice and so on. But the truth is that if there is genius in the American political system, and I think there is, it's closer to local school districts than it is to the Congress role in education decisionmaking. And tempting though it may be, I really wouldn't like to see the Government participate in education decisionmaking at that level.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I, too, want to thank the panel for being with us today, and regret that another committee meeting kept me away from part of it.

It certainly is a timely topic to try to make our educational process more efficient to try to educate this group of young people with the expanded universe of knowledge. We're trying to do with less dollars at almost every level.

Mr. Petri, the New York Times' lead story, says, "Court invalidates school financing in New York State bias against the poor found." I don't want to make Mr. Kildee feel bad, but as I walked into this meeting, the clerk's office right next door had the TV on with this story, two more school districts in Michigan shut down. We hear the assaults on expenditure. We hear talk about title I funding being reduced coming from our administration. In my home State of Minnesota, we read the headlines of a $500 million shortage in State funds. So it's difficult.

Mr. Petri already touched on this, but he's leaving, so he won't have to hear the redundance of it. You can go now. That's all right. As we think of the balance between the prerogatives of the States and the school districts, each guards his area jealously and, I guess, properly establishing policy on the local level.

At the same time, we have the NIE and other places where we can do research on the national level. My question is, How can we best see these programs implemented that research has proven to be effective? We have pilot schools that have done them well. I think of the teacher that was asked what she taught. The person asking was thinking of the subject, but she thought of the result, as said, "I teach kids."

I think this is kind of the attitude that we have to have. But can we have an economic carrot or a bureaucratic stick on the part of the Federal Government, or are there avenues within the private sector or within the educational mechanism itself to share ideas? I know it's a broad and general observation, maybe more than a question, but how can we put the research into practice and do a better job of it?

Anyone of you that wishes—and all of you can comment, if you wish.

Mr. EDMONDS. There are some things that are going on that are encouraging that can be made more encouraging. NIE is beginning to invest more in funding programs that are intended to evaluate what we're talking about. I think the major point to be made is that we now know more about the characteristics of effective schools than we know about how to put them into practice.

And that since we now have a number of natural settings that have decided on their own initiative to try to use effective schools' research as the basis for programs of improvement, then one of the things at which NIE is very good, is we could just do systematic evaluation of what that looks like in a variety of places in an attempt to get a better handle on how you use what we now know. I mean, we have to confess that we know a lot more about telling you what the schools should look like at the end of the program of intervention than we know now to tell you exactly how to design the program of intervention. That is a real gap in the knowledge. And I don't know of any substitute for long-term evaluation studies to get after that.

But the one thing the Federal Government can do now, because we have the technology to do it, and we have more than sufficient evidence in support of it, legislation in title I and other Federal programs that subsidize education, can be far more aggressive in insisting that local school officials demonstrate the role that evaluation played in their decision, either to repeat a program or to modify a program.

I mean, at this moment, we are hard pressed to understand the origin of the decision in a local school district to use any kind of outside resources in support of one program and at the expense of another.

And since the Federal Government has long had a tradition of saying that it wants evaluative data to accompany the reports of the use of its money, it does seem to me that you are now in a position to become a good deal more aggressive in saying that you want more than just the evaluation data. You want a description of the role that is played in what the local officials decided to do.

Because the major obstacle to their using what we're talking about is that evaluation plays a very, very modest role in education decisionmaking in most local schools.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Mr. Erdahl, would you complete it?

Mr. **ERDAHL**. Thank you very much. And if other panel members don't have any comments at this time, I'll thank you for this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Thank you. I assume there are no further questions. Again, the Chair would like to thank Ms. Bernstein, Dr. Rosenshine, and Mr. Edmonds. As my colleague on the left side of the aisle has indicated, an excellent program. I think it certainly stands as one of the finest hearings that we have conducted on the Education and Labor Committee, and certainly, this subcommittee.

And I think the presentations have been of great benefit to us, and we certainly wish to thank each of the witnesses.

That concludes the hearing this morning. The hearing will continue tomorrow morning at 9:30 in this room.

[The hearing was adjourned at 11:45 a.m., on October 27, 1981.]

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON URBAN EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1981

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:32 a.m. in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members Present: Representatives Perkins, Kildee, and Erdahl.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel; and John Smith, senior professional assistant.

Chairman **PERKINS**. The doors are closed, a quorum is present. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is continuing oversight hearings this morning on urban education.

The members of this subcommittee are aware that in recent years public education has come under severe scrutiny, evaluation, and criticism. But in listening to the critics we must not forget that there are public schools and public school systems in this country which are doing an excellent job of teaching the basic skills. We are also aware that some of the most rigorous teaching and learning is occurring in some of our most deprived, disadvantaged urban communities. How can this be explained when we are so often led to believe that just the reverse is true? I believe that some of our questions may be answered by today's witnesses.

Our witnesses today are practitioners of educational excellence who come from many different parts of our country. Through their experience as outstanding educators in urban school settings they are going to help us more clearly understand what educational components enable a school or program to demonstrate a high degree of effectiveness; what characteristics distinguish a more successful school or program from a less successful school or program, and what the Federal Government can do in order to encourage and support the growth of more effective schools in the Nation.

Given the current Federal policy espoused by the administration or withdrawal of the Federal support for education, how do you see this impacting on your school program?

Our first witness today is Dr. Rondle Edwards, superintendent of the East Cleveland Schools, East Cleveland, Ohio. We are delighted to have you here, Dr. Edwards. And Dr. Paul Loughran, assistant superintendent from up in New York. Come around both of you—Dr. Edwards. And we've got Dr. Hendrix likewise, here, from the Chattanooga Public Schools, Tennessee. We'll first hear from Dr.

Edwards; Dr. Hendrix, and then Dr. Paul Loughran. Go ahead, Dr. Edwards.

[The prepared statement of Rondle Edwards follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RONDLE E. EDWARDS, PH. D., SUPERINTENDENT, EAST CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOLS, EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO

Members of the House Education and Labor Committee, Officers in the Department of Education, Colleagues in Education, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to be able to speak about quality urban education today. It is as true today as it always has been that the education of our youth is our best guarantee for a bright future for our nation. More specifically, for youth in my community, education is their only hope of breaking the proverty cycle. I am pleased, also, that the East Cleveland Schools are being recognized as a deliverer of effective education to its students. My constant fear is that the loss of state and federal revenue could end all of this. Much of this forum today is a consideration of the appropriate federal role in American education.

A description of this federal role should begin and end with the assurance that "equality" and "excellence" are the purposes of federal educational actions.

America has a historic commitment to education that began with the nation's inception. This dedication to education has been, and will continue to be, fundamental to the growth and progress of our country. We need to keep in mind that education is the very cornerstone of successful democracy in America. Perhaps Thomas Jefferson has expressed it best: "If a nation expects to be both ignorant and free . . . it expects what never was and never will be."

It was from this national commitment that our present system of local schools has grown. We must build on this broader historic perspective while at the same time preserving the equally firm commitment to educational pluralism at the local level.

A key role of our federal government in education is to encourage and reinforce local initiative in facilitating quality education and school success. Equally important for the federal government is the role of initiating action when local commitments wane, cease to occur, or fail to deliver quality education for all citizens, regardless of race, social class or economic conditions.

George Washington, our first president, spoke of this national commitment when he said:

"In a country like this . . . if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady, regulating, and energetic hand to correct and control it."

John Adams enlarged upon this concept in stating that: "The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and be willing to bear the expense of it."

Finally, John F. Kennedy reminded us that: "The human mind is our fundamental resource . . . The Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of the Republic—it is time now to act decisively to fulfill that responsibility . . ."

The protection of the Civil Rights of minorities and the handicapped is certainly a role of the federal government. The correction of deficits and negative conditions due to the history of segregation throughout this nation is a moral and constitutional obligation of the federal government. Not to meet this obligation would result in a far more costly situation in terms of the compromising of our moral stature in relation to out national vigor and as an international leader.

Also, I believe that a citizenry armed with an adequate education is a most effective national defense tool. Additionally, the federal government has a definite role in what I call international education—an education for world understanding, for national defense and for worldwide commerce.

Perhaps a description of the East Cleveland community is in order at this point.

The city of East Cleveland, with a population of 38,000 is comprised of a 4-square-mile area, bordered on three sides by the inner city of Cleveland. Since 1970, East Cleveland has experienced a rapid loss in industry. There are approximately ten major employers in the district. Of these, only two, General Electric Company and Huron Road Hospital, employ over nine hundred persons. General Electric is the major industry in the community and accounts for approximately fifteen percent of East Cleveland's tax base. The loss of industry over the past decade has meant a serious decline in monies available each year to operate schools.

The city ranks second lowest among thirty-two municipalities in Cuyahoga County for family income; at the same time, it ranks second highest in the state (out of 678 school districts) in school tax millage collected for educational purposes.

Percentage of home ownership has shifted over the past decade from the highest in the county to the lowest. The unemployment rate by national statistics, as of July 19, 1981, is approximately fifteen percent.

Another indicator which illustrates the economic status of East Cleveland residents is the number of children in the school system who come from families who receive public assistance. Approximately thirty-six percent (3,101 out of 8,614) of students in attendance, as of October, 1981, come from such families. An additional twenty-eight percent of the students come from families whose yearly income falls belos the poverty line as established by the federal government. Approximately 42 percent of the students in the district qualify for a free or reduced price lunch. Moreover, the school district has the third lowest tax valuation per pupil of all city districts in the state.

The racial composition of the city is approximately 80 percent minority and 20 percent nonminority. A large percentage of the nonminority population consists of senior citizens living in low rent, high rise apartment complexes and other nonminorities concentrated in the southeastern portion of the city. In essense, since the nonminority populace is primarily concentrated in one section of the city, four-fifths of the city exists in racial isolation. Thus, the community, the most densely populated city in the state, is racially isolated and reflects a populace that quite clearly is suffering from economic insufficiency. However, despite the economic circumstances surrounding most families, the community has overtaxed itself in order that the children be provided with a quality education. East Cleveland is one of the very few communities in Ohio that has never rejected a school operating levy or bond issue. The community overwhelmingly passed an operating levy in the Fall of 1976 and a bond issue in the Spring of 1978. In a time in our history when school levies and bond issues were being rejected by the majority of communities in the state, East Cleveland residents responded positively, in spite of their economic circumstances, because they confidently believed that quality education is a major vehicle through which their children can free themselves of the yoke of poverty.

The East Cleveland school district is comprised of seven elementary schools (grades kindergarten—6), one middle school (grades 7 and 8), and one senior high schools (grades 9-12). Student enrollment in grades kindergarten through 12 numbers 8,614. Minority students comprise 98 percent of the total enrollment (predominantly Black, with less than 30 of the students Caucasian, Hispanic, Oriental and Vietnamese backgrounds).

At the elementary level, student enrollment in the various schools ranges from 300 students in the smallest to 820 in the largest. The middle school enrollment is 1,331 students while the senior high school has an enrollment of 2,573. A pupil-teacher ratio of 22 to 1 has been reached across the district. Students enrollment has continued to climb slowly.

Most of the school structures in the district were built between 1906 and 1930 and house the bulk of the students. Between 1950 and 1977, two elementary schools were replaced; a new vocational wing was added to the senior high school; and additions or major improvements were made to four elementary schools, the middle school, and the senior high school. Despite these efforts, space is still inadequate. A $7.6 million bond issue, approved by the voters in 1978, enabled the district to renovate the buildings and replace one elementary building.

Students mobility rate across the district poses serious problems for the school system and is an indication of the degree of resident transiency which is a community problem. During the last school year the student mobility rate for the district averaged 27 percent. The majority of students transferring into the district came from the inner city of Cleveland. In essence then, the majority of students in attendance have spent and continue to spend their lives in racial isolation.

It is important also to note that the student mobility rate for grades 9 through 12 is much higher than the district average. For the 1979-80 school year, this rate was approximately fifty percent. Thus, in a period of one school year, about one-half of the student body represents either new students or the large number of those who follow the pattern of transferring "in and out".

With this degree of mobility, it is difficult to design and maintain an instructional program that reflects continuity, to effectively assimilate new students into the school environment, to provide an educational program and learning environment that meets the affective and cognitive needs of all students.

In summary, over the past decade, the school system and community have been confronted with dramatic changes brought about by rapid racial and socio-economic changes. In turn, these events have created critical affective and instructional needs which have been faced with limited financial means. Thus, even if there were increased financial support at the local level, the East Cleveland Board of Education and the administration would have to continually seek outside funding as well as persistently lobby at the state level for increased basic aid in order to maintain an educational program that will meet the identified needs of all students.

Several years ago, then, the East Cleveland system was not much different than other urban schools of that time, with the poor attendance, poor achievement, and the vandalism conditions we're all familiar with. Experienced teachers had fled and of those who remained some found that their teaching styles, which formerly had been successful, no longer worked. Some others who remained pursued teaching strategies that were destined for failure from the onset. This latter group of teachers most often behaved in the classroom out of a negatively biased perception of the pupils and the families from which the pupils came. These same teachers were often those who covertly predicted that their pupils would not achieve academically and socially, and yet expressed alarm when the same negative predictions were actualized. Replacement teachers were young, inexperienced, and lacked skills and understandings required for teaching urban students. These latter two catetories of teachers expected learning to take place in classrooms with a sterile affective involvement of the teacher and the learner. Our first efforts to counteract these problems were in four areas: parent involvement, teacher training, enrichment instruction, and remediation. To restore quality education we needed to form a team of dedicated teachers and parents. We needed to establish an affective climate that would motivate students to learn and motivate teachers to stimulate achievement excellence.

A Home-School Liaison Program, funded under ESAA Title VI, enabled us to install Home Visitors in the schools to contact parents when children were absent or repeatedly tardy. They visited parents at home to develop joint action to help students with chronic behavior or attendance problems. We also established periodic teacher-parent conferences and encouraged teachers to phone parents to report both the good work or problem behavior of their children. These efforts communicated several messages to the parents: the schools expect students to be in attendance and to arrive promptly, that we care about their youngsters, and that we cannot educate their children without their active support. These same messages went to our staff. By initiating these steps, our teachers and administrators understood that parent cooperation is important to us and that we care about our students and their presence in school. Today, it is not an unusual event for both parents to leave work for a teacher conference if a child is experiencing problems. There is high attendance at Curriculum Nights, Open Houses, and parent-teacher organization meetings. Last year, over 800 parents, relatives and students attended the young Authors Conference at 8 a.m. on a Saturday, to see the books authored and published by their children.

Teacher training was accomplished in two ways. Local universities in conjunction with a school faculty, designed Masters degree programs with classes taught at the school site. These degrees programs were built around the identified teaching-learning needs of the East Cleveland school district. Also, a systematic effort to dismiss incompetent teachers was launched. The position of Curriculum Specialist was developed. These persons are experienced master teachers who have demonstrated the knowledge, teaching skill and interpersonal skills necessary to be an intructional leader, resource teacher, and teacher supervisor. We placed Curriculum Specialists in each school. These persons lead effective teachers and help the less effective to improve. The role of principal also is that of an instructional leader, so a team of teacher support is functioning in each building. Using a variety of strategies, the team tries to promote a positive self-concept of feeling of confidence in each teacher. We recognize that unless we demonstrate respect for the integrity of our staff, we cannot expect teachers to treat their students in this manner. We reward excellence and efforts of teachers and we expect them to treat students similarly. Through this staff development program, we demonstrate that our district cares about the welfare and performance of its teachers in the same way as it does about the students; that we have high expectations of our teachers, the same for our students.

Enrichment activities have taken several forms. The initial effort was the Enriched and Extended School Year Program. Elementary students at all grade levels attended school year round, with 1- and 2-week vacations scheduled periodically. These children and their teachers spent one to two week periods each month in one of ten nearby institutions in University Circle, such as the Cleveland Art Museum, Health Museum, Western Reserve Historical Society or Karamu Theater. These institutional staffs provided experiential learning that could not take place in the classroom. These extended visits also removed the students from their racially isolated environment and expanded their horizons. This program raised students' ability and achievement scores to a significant level. Later the program changed to conform to the regular school year, but the institutional educational experiences continued. Initially, this program was financed as a Title VI-ESAA Pilot Program. When that funding was eliminated, funds came from the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program (DPPF). The program was ended this past June when our DPPF funds were cut.

This enrichment program was important, not only for the stimulation it offered both to students and teachers, but also for the instructional style used. Teaching through active experiences is an appropriate method of learning for many urban children.

A program for our gifted and talented students has been implemented. Selected students attend special classes which offer a unique instructional program including French and Spanish languages. The program has received minimal funds from the state Gifted and Talented Program and is financed mainly through the operating budget. It extends from grades 2 through 12.

Foreign language instruction as enrichment is offered in each of our elementary schools. Last year, in state wide competition, our elementary student team took first prize. The program, also financed through general operating funds, includes grades three through high school. At the high school level, other languages are added to the curriculum. Plans are underway to strengthen the foreign language curriculum and to make credits in foreign language a high school graduation requirement.

An example of how we try to stimulate children is a smaller offering, the Career Awareness Program. Students who achieve well in math and science are enrolled in Saturday classes from grades 7 through 12. At the middle school level, as motivation, minority scientists and engineers provide them "hands on" experiences and act as role models. They are introduced to a wide range of careers.

At the high school level, field trips to regional universities are added to the program as well as weekly enrichment in math and science courses from college instructors. This program is supported by corporate and philanthropic foundations.

We also have upgraded the elementary music and art programs. Art teachers and music teachers are scheduled into each elementary school. We are proud of our district elementary chorus and an orchestra.

These enrichment programs have resulted in several benefits. Students' learning is accelerated, both teachers and students are motivated, and both teachers' and students' standards and expectations are raised. Parents are also affected. When their youngsters participate in enrichment activities, they are encouraged about their children's educational opportunities in our schools; they feel better about their students' academic progress and this positive feeling is reflected in their encouragement of their children.

Many of our students, however, for a variety of reasons are not achieving at grade level. We operate our own Preschool and Head Start Programs for ages 3 and 4, and Kindergarten for the 5-year-olds. An Early School Prevention Screening Program, an NDN (National Diffusion Network) offering initiated through Ohio Title IV-C Adoption Grants, was begun three years ago. General operating funds now support the program. It includes ages 4 and 5, and first graders. Children are screened for developmental deficits and a prescriptive remedial plan is prescribed. The program has been demonstrated as being effective by pre-post scores. At the elementary level, Title I Reading Teachers give remedial reading instruction to eligible students. This continues through the middle school. At the high school, general funds provide remedial reading and math labs and state Disadvantaged Vocational Funds support two vocational reading labs.

These remedial programs also communicate a variety of messages to parents and staff: that the system cares about the achievement of all students, the successful and the less successful; that we strive to meet the needs of each child.

Another strategy designed to help regain control of the schools and re-establish a positive learning climate was to reorganize the structure of the middle school and high school.

Our middle school annually copes with 200 to 400 more students than can be comfortably housed, has two grade levels, 7 and 8. Half of the student body is new to the school each year. These are pre-adolescent students and their stage of development results in their being demanding challenges to parents and teachers alike. With initial private foundation support, the middle school was restructured into a unit system, called the Multiflex Curriculum. Each unit, led by a master teacher, consisted of core curriculum teachers in math, science, English and social studies. These teachers stayed together and with their classes through both grade levels. They occupied contiguous classrooms, restricting students' hall movements. A similar structure was instituted in the ninth grade at the high school to ease students' transition.

Students follow a traditional schedule as a sophmore, except that they must take two courses from a choice of math, science, or social studies. This insures that students have 2 years of either math or science, since both are required the first year. At the junior level, students must elect to enter one of four interdisciplinary schools: Fine Arts, Humanities, Practical Arts or Math/Science, or Vocational Education. In addition, they have three electives. Their senior year requires only English and the rest of their schedule is tailored to their interests and goals through electives.

These organizational designs at the middle and high schools have fastened the establishment of a feeling of closeness among groups of teachers, groups of students and between small groups of teachers and students. A peer support system is allowed to develop which gives both teachers and students a base from which to concentrate on the task at hand; producing well educated students.

The final component of our educational efforts that I'd like to describe is our building and maintenance program. Previously, I mentioned our recent extensive building renovation project. We also have a vigorous maintenance schedule. Our buildings are inspected monthly and needed maintenance scheduled promptly. You can walk down the hall at any time of the day in any of our schools and see attractive and clean walks and sparkling windows. You will find no graffiti, no broken windows, no vandalism. All school grounds are well maintained and attractively landscaped. For it is our belief that a well-maintained and attractive physical plant will positively affect the attitudes and actions of the staff and students who spend the majority of their waking hours in that environment. We know that for many students, the only clean physical space in their lives is at the school. The attractive buildings also send messages to the people of the community; that school is a desirable place to be and that they as taxpayers are responsible for these attractive schools.

I've described some of the strategies that were employed in East Cleveland that resulted in a comprehensive and high quality educational program. I'd like now to outline the essential factors that I believe that these actions represent.

1. Leadership.—From the entire central office administrative staff, to each building administrative group, to the leaders among teachers and parents. Each group has a role to perform, but the tone and direction are set in the superintendent's office. Leadership is not just decision making. It is planning; it is dedication and hard work each day at all levels. It is constant monitoring and communicating among and within all levels.

2. Use of knowledge.—We are continuously inundated with information, from within and from outside the school district. It is sometimes easy to become involved in daily routines and problem solving and thereby ignore information that could aid us in achieving our goals. Two examples are achievement test scores and research results. We are persistently making an effort to use these types of useful information. We use program evaluation and test scores to help make decisions about program changes. This strategy also builds in an accountability factor. We attempt to sift through educational research and use that which seems to be significant for our schools. For example, this year we have undertaken systemwide staff development on the concept of "Time on Task", and will incorporate the teaching strategies from that research throughout the system.

3. Attitudes and affect.—After describing our actions taken in each of the areas of programs, organization, personnel and building maintenance, I suggested several nonverbal messages that resulted from these activities. I think it is important for us to be aware that our actions taken and those omitted always communicate attitudes and values held by the decision makers. While the effect of each strategy alone may be minimal, when several actions are taken, a consistent message develops and becomes a powerful influence on the receivers, a climate is created. And attitudes are a key ingredient to successful schools. Our teachers and administrators care about the students, about the parents, and about each other. As a group, we are a part of and are involved in community life. Our attitudes influence our expectations of each other and of our students. Attitudes exist whether or not we are aware of them, and since they are so powerful, it is essential to create the best possible climate for attitudinal influence.

4. Successful instruction.—There are several common characteristics among the programs I've described and we've found these qualities to lead to improved achievement. One is enrichment. All children are entitled to enrichment activities which will stimulate ideas and motivate them to learn. These activities will also help students to acquire concepts. Concepts are amorphous entities which are difficult to describe, teach, or to learn. Many urban students, especially those who have been educationally disadvantaged, need to be active participants in their learning; they need to experience learning, not be told about it. Planning this kind of learning takes experienced, creative teachers who are willing to make the extra effort and use extra time to structure lessons. And these extra efforts are deserving of more rewards than we are able to give to our dedicated staff.

The variety of strategies I've been describing combine to form an educational process that is successful in many ways. But we realize that it is necessary to accomplish more. Currently, we are revising our district language arts and math curricula and will soon undertake the same task for science and social studies. We have been forced to alter or eliminate some programs due to reductions in federal and state funding. These losses are affecting the level of our students' education. Yet, a quality education is the only avenue by which our youngsters will be able to improve their quality of life. Our students may come to us as culturally, educationally and economically disadvantaged. We are determined that they succeed in spite of these obstacles.

Our community supports their schools and has demonstrated this support by never rejecting a levy or bond issue. Yet the poverty level in the community is so great that local taxes cannot be the sole support of the schools. If these future generations are not to be doomed to the unemployment and welfare roles like many members of their families, the federal and state governments must fulfill their responsibilities to the schools. In the long run, quality education is much cheaper than unemployment.

STATEMENT OF RONDLE E. EDWARDS, SUPERINTENDENT, EAST CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOLS, EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO

Dr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Perkins. Members of the House Education and Labor Committee, and officers in the Department of Education, colleagues in education, ladies, and gentlemen.

It certainly is my pleasure to speak about quality urban education today. I am most encouraged to know that you care enough to be here and that you are also concerned. I will rely very heavily upon reading from an abbreviated form of my formal presentation. Hopefully that way we'll leave much time for many of your questions that I will certainly be very happy to try to answer.

The education of our youth today is our best guarantee for a bright future for our Nation. For most of the youth of my community, and that is East Cleveland, education is certainly their only hope of breaking away from the poverty cycle and living productive lives. I am also pleased that the East Cleveland schools are being recognized today as a deliverer of effective education to its students. We have worked hard for this over the past 5 years and we are pleased to be so recognized.

However, my constant fear is that the loss of State and Federal revenue could end so much of this effectiveness. Much of this forum today, I believe, is a consideration of the appropriate role, appropriate Federal role, in American education. Therefore, I do wish your indulgence in a few comments on that role.

First, I believe that a description of the Federal role should begin and end with the assurance of equality and excellence. America's historic commitment to education has been and will continue to be fundamental to the growth and progress of our Nation. We need to keep in mind that education is the very cornerstone of successful democracy in America. Thomas Jefferson has expressed this quite well, and I quote: "If a Nation expects to be both ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

It certainly was from this type of national commitment expressed by Thomas Jefferson that our present system of even local schools has grown. I believe that we must build on this historic broader perspective while at the same time preserving the equally firm commitment to educational pluralism at the local level.

Again, a key role of the Federal Government is to encourage and reinforce local initiative, facilitating quality education and school success. Equally important for the Federal Government is the role of initiating action when local commitments wane, when local commitments cease to occur or when they otherwise fail to deliver quality education for all citizens regardless of race, social class, or economic conditions.

John F. Kennedy, again, has reminded us that,

> The human mind is our fundamental resource * * * the Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of this great republic.

Certainly the protection of the civil rights of minorities and the handicapped is a role of the Federal Government that should be well pronounced today. The correction of deficits and negative conditions due to the history of segregation throughout this Nation is a moral and constitutional obligation of the Federal Government. Also, I believe that a citizenry armed with an adequate education is a most effective national defense tool. Furthermore, the Federal Government has a definite role in what I refer to as international education, education for world understanding, for national defense, and certainly for world commerce.

A description of the East Cleveland community is well documented in the formal statement that I have prepared and is available here. Therefore, I will not spend a great deal of time going to that because it will take up much of the time that I have for testimony.

I do wish to point out some aspects of the East Cleveland community very briefly. The city of East Cleveland has a population of 38,000 people and is comprised of 4 square miles, and it borders on three sides the city of Cleveland. We always hasten to add, in East Cleveland, that we are a separate city. There's nothing wrong with Cleveland, but we want to be properly identified.

Since 1970, East Cleveland has experienced rapid loss of industry that has meant a serious decline in the moneys available to public education to operate schools. Approximately 36 percent of the students in attendance come from families on public assistance. Forty-two percent of the students in the district qualify for free or reduced price lunch. The racial composition of the city is approximately 80 percent minority, and when I say, in East Cleveland 80 percent minority, I am speaking of black.

To summarize, the population characteristics of East Cleveland create critical educational needs that have to be met with limited financial resources. East Cleveland, the most densely populated city in Ohio, is racially isolated and reflects a populace that quite clearly is suffering from economic insufficiency.

Yet, this community has continued to tax itself in order that the children be provided with the quality education. I want to say this loud and clear, that East Cleveland is one of the few communities in Ohio that has never rejected a school operating levy or bond issue in the 139-year history of that school district. That's quite a record for a school district in Ohio.

Now, a few words about the school district. First of all, it is comprised of 7 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school; a total school population of approximately 8,614 students. Minority students, again, in the school system comprise 98 percent of the total enrollment. We are pleased to report a pupil-teacher ratio of 22 to 1. However, our student population continues to climb each year. Over the past decade the school system and community have experienced rapid racial and economic change. These events have created a critical affective and instructional needs which have been faced with, again, limited financial resources.

Permit me here to just briefly—and this is for the sake of future questions—to review what I call the four phases of Federal aid to East Cleveland schools, from 1960 to 1980. Not much different than other urban areas. First, I'll say, the early 1960's were the beginning of desegregation. During this period token integration was acceptable by the community, but there was the constant fear that Federal money would accelerate it. Thus, very little was applied for in Federal money to improve education.

Then there's the early to mid-seventies, when we had an increased minority population in the schools. Federal money then was sought after, it was actively sought after, but to solve the minority problem, not to necessarily improve schools for all, but to solve the minority problem. What can we do with the rush, the onslaught of minorities coming into our school district?

Then I would look at the late 1970's when the schools were predominantly black and Federal money was withdrawn, since in the minds of Federal officials nearly all black schools did not constitute racial isolation.

I have been here before to talk about this concept to members of the Department of Education and certainly to some key legislators. New rulings on title VII to say that when a district becomes predominantly black, almost all black, the problems of isolation are not to be attended by Federal aid through title VII, now title VI.

The fourth phase, today, 1981, a time of State financial crisis in Ohio and elsewhere, the Federal Government expresses its desire to abdicate responsibility for the general welfare through education.

Now, briefly, I want to get into the problem and what we did about it. And this is what happened to East Cleveland. The problem I'll state, and what we did about it. I want to advise that much of the help did come from Federal funds but certainly now greatly on the wane.

Several years ago the East Cleveland system was not much different from other urban schools. Violence, vandalism, low morale, low achievement, and poor attendance were common. Experienced teachers fled and of those who remained many pursued teaching strategies that were destined for failure from the onset. This latter group that remained behaved in the classroom out of a negative, biased perception of the pupils and of the families from which the pupils came.

These same teachers were often those who covertly predicted social and academic failure for their pupils and yet expressed alarm when these negative predictions were actualized. Newly recruited teachers were inexperienced and despite interest that they had in the young people they lacked the necessary skills to do very much about it.

Now, our efforts to counteract these problems were in four areas: Parent involvement, teacher training, enrichment instruction, and remediation. We needed to establish an affective climate that would motivate students' learning and motivate teachers to draw out excellence from their students. In other words, we sought a team of dedicated teachers, administrators, and parents.

Now, under ESAA title VI we initiated a home-school liaison program. Home-school visitors would monitor student attendance and tardiness, parents of chronic absentees were called, home conferences were held to get parents involved in solving their youngsters' behavior problems, parent and teacher conferences were scheduled periodically and teachers were encouraged to call parents for both the good that they did and certainly for their behavior problems. Parents and teachers alike learned that students were expected to be in school everyday and that we needed the active participation of parents in order to educate their students.

Today—and I'm pleased with this—today it is not unusual for both parents, working parents, to leave work for a teacher conference if a child is experiencing a problem. There is high attendance at what we call curriculum night, open houses, and certainly at parent-teacher organization meetings.

Teacher training took two directions. Several local universities offered masters degree level programs for our schools. Classes were held at the various school buildings after school. These graduate programs were built around the identified teaching-learning needs of our school district. Also, a systematic effort to dismiss incompetent teachers was launched. And I want to emphasize: Yes, we dismissed many incompetent teachers.

The second thrust was to install curriculum specialists in each building. These master teachers with exceptional interpersonal skills led other effective teachers and certainly helped those who were less effective to improve. We have developed the same high expectations of our teachers that we have for our students.

Enrichment activities also took several forms. The enriched and extended school year program sent elementary classes into nearby museums and theaters for 1- to 2-week learning experiences. These extended visits removed the students from their racially isolated environments and expanded their horizons. As all-black, predominantly black schools, we did not have a large number of white youngsters for our youngsters to integrate with. The integrative experiences could not be had in that mode. But we did use title VI and earlier title VII funds to transport these students to places where they could have integrated involvements, virtually integrated involvements, and thereby raise their horizons.

Transporting students to these cultural institutions for experiential learning raised IQ's and we can document that in achievement scores. Under title VI these programs were originally funded, and later they were transferred to State funding. I am bothered to add that this program was eliminated this past June when State funds were not available. Title VI moneys, I will add, have to be used for integrating only bodies, that was the purpose; not for the equally valuable experiences of expanding horizons.

We are in the fourth year of a program for gifted and talented students. Students attend special classes where the curriculum and teaching methods better meet their needs. I am pleased to hear the most recent pronouncements on foreign languages here in the Congress. I want to say that foreign language instruction is being offered in all of our elementary schools. For instance, Spanish instruction is taking place from grade 3 through the high school.

Our career education program includes designs for high ability students interested in science or other careers. From grade 7 through 12 they attend Saturday classes at the local high school and middle school as well as local colleges to introduce them to a wide range of careers to upgrade their math and science skills. Our full career education program extends from kindergarten through 12.

We have also improved our elementary art and music programs. Specialists are scheduled into each elementary school. Last year a districtwide course, elementary, and a districtwide elementary orchestra were established.

These enrichment programs have several benefits. Both students and teachers are stimulated. Students' learning is accelerated and both teachers' and students' expectations are raised. And I want to emphasize for the sake of your questions, expectations being raised on the part of students as well as on the part of teachers. Parents also are encouraged when their children participate in these program designs.

We have several remedial elementary reading and mathematics programs under title I and certainly Head Start over the last 7 to 10 years. It's been truly a success. We have screened kindergarten children for learning problems and prescribed remedial activities for identified deficits. At the high school we have three reading labs and two mathematics labs with partial funding from the State disadvantaged vocational funds. As you well know, much of the vocational moneys for the States come from Federal sources, and that vocational money has been greatly cut.

One other successful program strategy I would love to mention briefly is that at the middle school and the first year of high school we installed small units of students and teachers to increase student-teacher closeness and reduce the extent to which students travel alone through halls and corridors. Other organizational structures have created teacher support teams and a close relationship between the smaller group of students and their teachers.

The final component of our efforts to restore excellence in the East Cleveland schools has been our building maintenance program. Ron Edmonds was here yesterday and I'm certain that he mentioned the value of facilities when we try to exact effective schools. All of our buildings have been renovated or replaced within the last several years. A regularly scheduled onsite building inspection insures that building repairs and cleanliness are accomplished. You find no broken windows or vandalism in our schools. We maintain the buildings and grounds and we provide an attractive environment for students and teachers. This instills pride in the community.

In closing, let me say that the sum of these efforts have made East Cleveland an effective school district. Yet today we are in the midst of program cuts and elimination due to the reductions in Federal and State funding. These losses will affect the quality of education our students are receiving and it is this very education which is the only avenue by which our youngsters will be able to improve the quality of their lives and add to the quality of this Nation.

Most of our students, as I have indicated before, come to us educationally disadvantaged. They come from highly transient families. The school just might be the most stable factor in their lives. We are determined that our students will succeed in spite of these obstacles but we do need help. We are supported by our parents in this effort. In spite of high taxes that they impose on themselves, we know that we will have to continue to seek outside funding. If these future generations are not to be doomed to poverty and unemployment, certainly the Federal Government must fulfill its historic responsibility, its historic role to public institutions.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hurried through that because I knew that it would exceed the 10 minutes allotted here, but I do hope that you will have some questions whereby I might be able to expand on those concepts and add more to what I am proud of as one quality school district. I hope you will come to visit us sometime.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much for an excellent statement. We will hear the other witnesses before interrogation. The next witness is Dr. Hendrix. Go ahead.

[The prepared statement of Clifford Hendrix follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. CLIFFORD L. HENDRIX, JR., ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES, CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

CHATTANOOGA PUSH FOR EXCELLENCE: AN APPROACH TO MEETING THE NEEDS OF QUALITY URBAN EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

I am extremely honored to have been invited to participate with this panel on this occasion to address the Congressional Committee on Education and Labor and this Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education regarding some factors contributing to effective and quality education in urban public schools of these United States.

In recent decades the problems and issues pertaining to urban education have been widely researched and published. Out of this emphasis has emerged a mass of theory and concepts focusing on those characteristics which denote an effective climate for learning and those qualities that ensure a meaningful instructional program especially for the poor children in urban districts.

This presentation will attempt to address these same concerns by sharing with you just one example of a Demonstration Program which is attempting to put some of these theories and concepts into practice. It is a program which while still in its infancy, has received more than its share of scrutiny, criticism, and media exposure. The unusual attention, perhaps, is attributed to its creator, the charismatic and controversial founder and President of Operation PUSH and the PUSH for Excellence Program, Reverend Jesse Jackson. He, his staff, and the program sites across the country, have had great difficulty in transforming a dream—a movement—into a legitimate educational proposal. My reference will focus specifically on the PUSH for Excellence Program of Chattanooga, Tennessee, which has experienced a reasonable success in its initial efforts to demonstrate how certain factors can make a difference in improving the quality of education in urban, inner-city neighborhoods.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The PUSH for Excellence (PUSH/Excel) Project had its beginning through the inspiration and foresight of Rev. Jesse Jackson when about 1975 he began to speak about some extremely difficult problems confronting the nation's public schools. These were certainly familiar problems to educators and some community leaders, especially those in the larger urban areas. Student apathy and lack of motivation, drug abuse, low performance in academic performance, violence and misbehavior on school property were just a few of the many issues discussed in the media, at professional conferences, in school disciplinary hearings, and in university departments of education. The popular conclusion was that problems like these were characteristic of schools serving minority and low income students.

An unfortunate fact was that as educational and job opportunities were beginning to reach out to previously denied minorities, and as racial and class barriers were being lifted, too many students were not investing their efforts in preparation for these opportunities. Students in large measures were not pursuing excellence through good school attendance, hard work and setting goals, self-discipline, and personal integrity.

Rev. Jackson did not place the total blame on the students, however. Other segments of the community were also charged with a share of the responsibility, namely: the parents, by their lack of concern; the school, through their low expectations for student performance and achievement, as well as their ill-defined and poorly implemented standards of student behavior; and the community, because of its lack of interest in what goes on in the schools. He concluded that students, parents, and communities must become partners in the solution. Thus, the concept of Excel's "total involvement" had its birth.

THE PUSH FOR EXCELLENCE MOVEMENT IN CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

The Chattanooga program had its beginning in an extensive, grass roots campaign, led by the moderator of the local Operation PUSH Chapter. In August 1977, PUSH/Excel proponents started at the community level by circulating a petition among residents of various target neighborhoods. The petition outlined several aspects of the Chicago-based movement and was eventually signed by an estimated 3,000-4,000 people.

Subsequent efforts were directed at publicizing the proposal and gaining the support of key citizens, the Board of Education, and the local Chamber of Commerce. The program began formally in July 1979, when the Chattanooga Public School System entered into contract with PUSH for Excellence, Inc.

ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM

Chattanooga PUSH/Excel is a motivation program. In accordance with the national thrust, it is designed to challenge and involve the maximum number of persons and organizations, especially parents, to impact creatively and constructively on public education. It seeks to take the school from isolation and put it in the center of a positive social-cultural environment.

Responsibility for the administration of the program is divided into two parts. The PUSH/Excel Director and Assistant Director are responsible for implementing all activities that originate in the community by community participants. Six school-community liaison workers are assigned to each of the six participating schools and work under the direction of the PUSH/Excel Director in carrying out both school and community activities.

The School District Coordinator is the administrator who is responsible for coordinating all in-school activities with principals, teachers, and students of the participating schools. To assist him are six staff-advisors who are full-time professional staff members assigned to each of the six schools, but who devote up to one-third of their time providing in-kind services to the program in their respective schools.

Three high schools, three junior high, and beginning this school year, two elementary schools comprise the eight participating schools. Approximately 3,500 students make up the total enrollment of which approximately 70 percent of the students are black. Two of the high schools are completely black.

All of the schools are located in neighborhoods in the urban core of the city. These schools were selected primarily because of their location and need. In these neighborhoods 70 percent of the families have incomes at or below the poverty level. However, another important criteria for selection of these schools was a willingness and commitment by the principal and school staff to support this type of community involvement.

Responsibility for citywide planning and development is charged to a community advisory board. This body endorses and interprets the national goals common to all sites, and acts in behalf of the Chattanooga School Board to insure the effective implementation of the program both in the community and the schools.

Program implementation in the schools is initiated by the principal of each participating school who chairs a school advisory committee consisting of parents, teachers, students, and community representatives. This committee identifies school specific needs and goals to be accomplished with assigned activities and programs.

SELECTED PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES BY CATEGORIES OF PARTICIPANTS

In keeping with the "total involvement" concept, the Chattanooga PUSH-Excel Program assigns specific objectives and activities or outcomes to eight distinct groups or categories. These groups are selected because they represent particular persons who influence, in some way, the cognitive and effective development of students. The eight categories which have the responsibility for providing solutions and alternatives to certain problems that students face today are: Parents, students, principals, teachers, churches, organizations business and industry, and the media.

This report does not attempt to identify all of the objectives and activities assigned to the various categories. Instead, examples of each are selected here to demonstrate how significant individuals and groups impact upon the students' learning environment and their future development.

A. Parents.—In order to better facilitate the learning and academic growth of students, parents are being asked to volunteer their services and work cooperatively with school personnel. Thus, the participating schools are getting parents to arrange school visits, complete parent-teacher conferences, pick up report cards, and assist as volunteers with certain school activities to a much greater extent than before the program was implemented.

B. Students.—In order to achieve the ultimate of excellence in education, students are expected to become more responsible for enhancing their chances of receiving a fair and equitable education. Hence, students in the participating schools now, more than ever, are attending school and classes more regularly, attempting to improve their academic standing, and receiving information regarding career opportunities.

C. Principals.—In every aspect of the PUSH for Excellence program the role of the principal as a dynamic and effective leader is emphasized. Thus, this key person is expected to provide direction to the school's advisory committee where important decisions are made concerning prioritizing objectives for the school, determining activities to be completed, and deciding on procedures for coordinating community support. Without exception, principals of the participating schools are providing more leadership in surveying the problems of school, setting objectives for improvement, mobilizing staff and students for commitment to positive action, and seeking out parents, business leaders, ministers, community leaders, and media representatives to operationalize the "total involvement" concept.

D. Teachers.—As efforts are being made to improve the school climate, reduce discipline problems, and change apathetic attitudes, teachers are expected to plan for more effectiveness in teaching with higher expectations of students in learning. Teachers are now preparing daily lesson plans which focus on a diagnostic-assessment instructional approach to teaching the basic academic skills. Further, teachers are applying classroom instructional techniques so that students are preparing to think about the future. Thus, students now more than ever in the participating schools are being exposed to the world of work through field trips to businesses, industries, and governmental and social agencies. Also, representatives from the work places are being invited to visit classes and help students become better informed about career opportunities.

E. Churches.—Since churches are still a catalyst around which people revolve and intertwine their lives, they are being asked to extend their role in areas which are considered relevant to the education and well-being of its youth. As a result of this new alliance between the church and the school community, ministers are serving on the advisory committee of each participating school. Parents and community representatives are being reached through the church congregation to encourage their involvement in the neighborhood schools. Churches are donating their facilities for parent meetings and tutorial programs, and recognition programs and scholarship awards are being given to honor students who excel and have shown great improvement over the previous school year.

F. Organizations:—Since excellence in performance and the desire to help create an improved society are worthy goals of most organizations, they are being solicited to become involved in ways that will motivate and encourage youth to excel in all aspects of school and community life. In fulfilling this goal, organizations are volunteering their time and resources: to provide academic assistance after school, to conduct workshops to help students improve their test-taking skills, to formulate a speakers bureau to be available to the participating schools, and to recognize achievement of students with scholarships and certificates of merit.

G. Business and industry:—Educators have long been criticized for not involving professionals in business, industry, and Government in helping students prepare for a future livelihood. Consequently, now more than ever, reputable community firms and their leaders are being asked to contribute their expertise through career education activities, adopt-a-school programs, after school work experiences, student tours, classroom consultants and scholarships to deserving students.

H. Media:—It is generally agreed that the media has a significant influence on the behavior of students and should be used to transshape students' views of their present and future. Thus, officials of local radio, television, and newspapers are participating in a most effective way to: (1) provide a forum for students to present their views while improving their communication skills, (2) publicize the excellent programs to project a more positive image of the school, (3) inform students of the importance of an education for future success, thereby helping to reinforce the school's objectives, and (4) serve on advisory committees of the participating schools to become better informed about the various programs and activities.

CONCLUSIONS/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXPANDING PROGRAM GOALS

Since the Chattanooga PUSH/Excel program began in the 1979–80 school year, it has produced encouraging results. Attendance has increased an average of 4 percent among the schools represented in the program. The percent of students withdrawing from school has declined in all except one of the schools, indicating improved persistence. Generally, test scores at PUSH/Excel schools have improved at a more rapid rate than has been noted for other schools in the Chattanooga City system. And, through all of the PUSH/Excel activities within the school and community, parents in general are at least beginning to demonstratre an awareness of what the program is about and their role in the "total involvement" movement.

While in the short existence of this program, many of the activities have reaped some measure of student excellence, there are still strategies with certain target groups which need further attention. In a recent summary evaluation of the Chattanooga Program, the Project Director for the American Institutes for Research, the National Evaluation Agency for PUSH for Excellence Program, reported that "while this demonstration site comes closest to the 'total involvement' approach envisioned by the program's founder, it has not fully implemented the model." The report stressed further the need to mobilize long-term volunteer support from parents and the community, and work to achieve some of the basic objectives of the original movement, for example, "parental monitoring of study hours, and from students, increased self-initiated efforts to achieve."

GOALS FOR FUTURE PROGRAM EMPHASIS

We believe that the PUSH for Excellence Program and its concept of getting the total community involved in reaching common goals is one approach to making urban (especially inner city) schools more instructionally effective for poor children. The National Evaluation Reports from AIR substantiates the worth and potential success of PUSH/Excel. Their criticisms and recommendations, such as the ones already mentioned, are constructive as well as instructive in suggesting possible new strategies for future consideration.

I believe that the Federal government is interested in supporting educational proposals which originate from concerned citizens and attempt to address quality education and school success for the less fortunate, and, therefore, Federal officials must not desert local and state governments in their struggle to maintain financial support for such promising proposals.

In closing, the Chattanooga PUSH/Excel Program has an unfinished agenda which, like many other state and local programs, may not survive without continued support at the Federal level. As the staff continues to plan and work, efforts will be directed toward improved strategies for the following expanded goals:

1. To work more effectively with target students who have been identified as chronic absentees, chronic failures, and serious discipline problems;
2. To assist school staffs in developing techniques for students to become more responsible for planning and deciding on realistic future goals and careers;

3. To provide instructions and support for parents on how to organize for supervised study time for their children in the home;

4. To develop more effective strategies for community involvement, including specific directions for business and industry, churches, community organizations, recreational centers, and the public media;

5. To plan orientation for parent and community groups about the public education system with emphasis on how to get thier concerns heard and their needs met in the interest of a better education for their children; and

6. To develop a more complete summer program which will involve the staff in making contacts with churches, businesses, and community centers to plan future activities; and complete group sessions with students and parents who need help to improve their school relationships.

We believe that program objectives and strategies which attempt to include all facets of community support will come closest to the ultimate goal of providing a wholesome learning environment and a quality instructional program for the less fortunate young citizens of this nation. And we believe, further, that the leaders of the Federal government have not only the responsibility of continued financial support to these endeavors, but also the right to monitor and evaluate the extent to which the funds are serving its purpose and achieving its goals.

STATEMENT OF CLIFFORD L. HENDRIX, JR., ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES, CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Dr. HENDRIX. Thank you, Mr. Perkins, and other members of this subcommittee. I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to participate on this panel and share with you some factors which we feel contribute to quality education in the urban schools of these United States.

In recent decades the problems and issues pertaining to urban education have been widely researched and published. And out of this emphasis has emerged a mass of theory and concepts focusing on those characteristics which denote an effective climate for learning and those qualities that insure a meaningful instructional program, especially for the poor children in the urban districts.

This presentation will attempt to address these same concerns by sharing with you just one example of a demonstration program which is attempting to put some of these theories and concepts into practice. My reference will focus specifically on the push for excellence program of Chattanooga, Tenn., which has experienced reasonable success in its initial efforts to demonstrate how certain factors can make a difference in improving the quality of education in certain inner city schools.

The push for excellence project had its beginning through the inspiration and foresight of the Reverend Jesse Jackson when about 1975 he began to speak about some extremely difficult problems confronting the Nation's public schools. These were certainly familiar problems to educators and some community leaders. Student apathy and lack of motivation, drug abuse, low performance in academic achievement, violence and misbehavior on school property were just a few of the many issues discussed in the media, at professional conferences, and in university departments of education. The popular conclusion was that problems like these were characteristic of schools serving minority and low income students.

An unfortunate fact was that as educational and job opportunities were beginning to reach out to previously denied minorities and as racial and class barriers were being lifted, too many students were not investing their efforts in preparation for these opportunities.

Reverend Jackson did not place the total blame on students, however. Other segments of the community were also charged with their share of the responsibility: namely, the parents by their lack of concern; the schools through their low expectations of student performance and achievement as well as their ill-defined and poorly implemented standards of student behavior; and the community because of its lack of interest in what goes on in the schools. He concluded that students, parents, and communities must become partners in the solution. Thus the concept of total involvement had its birth.

The Chattanooga program had its beginning in an extensive, grass roots campaign, led by the moderator of the local Operation PUSH chapter. In August 1977, PUSH/Excel proponents started at the community level by circulating a petition among residents of various target neighborhoods. The petition outlined several aspects of the Chicago-based movement and was eventually signed by an estimated 3,000 to 4,000 people.

Subsequent efforts were directed at publicizing the proposal and gaining the support of key citizens, the board of education, and the local chamber of commerce. The program began formally in July 1979, when the Chattanooga Public School System entered into contract with PUSH for Excellence, Inc.

Chattanooga PUSH/Excel is a motivation program. In accordance with the national thrust, it is designed to challenge and involve the maximum number of persons and organizations, especially parents, to impact creatively and constructively on public education. It seeks to take the school from isolation and put it in the center of a positive social-cultural environment.

Three high schools, three junior high, and beginning this school year, two elementary schools comprise the eight participating schools. Approximately 3,500 students make up the total enrollment of which approximately 70 percent of the students are black. Two of the high schools are completely black.

All of the schools are located in neighborhoods in the urban core of the city.

These schools were selected primarily because of their location and the need, as 70 percent of the families in these neighborhoods have incomes at or below the poverty level.

In keeping with the total involvement concept Chattanooga PUSH/Excel program assigns specific objectives and activities or outcomes to eight distinct groups or categories. These groups are selected because they represent particular persons who influence in some way the cognitive and affective development of students.

This report does not attempt to identify all of the objectives and activities assigned to these eight categories. Instead, examples of each are selected here to demonstrate how significant individuals and groups impact upon the students' learning environment and their future development.

First, parents: In order to better facilitate the learning and academic growth of students, parents are being asked to volunteer their services by arranging school visits, completing parent-teacher conferences, picking up report cards, and assisting as volunteers in certain school activities.

Students: In order to achieve the ultimate of excellence in education students are expected to become more responsible for enhancing their chances of receiving a fair and equitable education. Now, more than ever, students are attending school and classes more regularly, attempting to improve their academic standing, and receiving information regarding career opportunities.

Principals: In every aspect of the PUSH for Excellence program the role of the principal as a dynamic and effective leader is emphasized. Thus, this key person is expected to provide direction to the school's advisory committee where important decisions are made concerning prioritizing objectives for the school.

Teachers: Teachers are now preparing daily lesson plans which focus on teaching of the basic skills. They are applying classroom instructional techniques so that students are preparing to think about the future. Their students, now more than ever, are being exposed to the world of work as representatives from the workplaces are being invited to visit classes and help students become better informed about career opportunities.

Churches: Since churches are still a catalyst around which people revolve and intertwine their lives, they are being asked to extend their role. In this new alliance between the church and the school, ministers are serving on the advisory committee of each participating school. Churches are donating their facilities for parent meetings and tutorial programs, and recognition programs and scholarship awards are being given to honor students who excel and have shown great improvement over the previous school year.

Organizations: Since excellence in performance and the desire to help create an improved society are worthy goals of most organizations, they are being solicited to become involved by providing academic assistance after school, conducting workshops to help students improve their test-taking skills, formulating a speakers' bureau to be available to participating schools, and recognizing achievement of students with scholarships and certificates of merit.

Business and industry: Educators have long been criticized for not involving professionals in business, industry, and Government in helping students prepare for a future livelihood. Consequently, now, reputable community firms and their leaders are being asked to contribute their expertise through career education activities, adopt-a-school programs, afterschool work experiences, student tours, classroom consultants, and scholarships to deserving students.

The media: It is generally agreed that the media has a significant influence on the behavior of students and should be used to help shape students' views of their present and future. Thus, officials of local radio, television, and newspapers are participating in a most effective way to provide a forum for students to present their views and improve their communication skills, to publicize outstanding programs to provide a more positive image of the school, and inform students of the importance of an education for future success, thereby helping to reinforce the school's objectives.

Since the Chattanooga PUSH/Excel program began in the school year of 1979–80, it has produced encouraging results. Attendance has increased an average of 4 percent among the schools represented in the program. The percentage of students withdrawing from school has declined in all except one of the schools, indicating improved persistence. Generally, test scores at the PUSH/Excel schools have improved at a more rapid rate than has been noted for the other schools in the school system.

While, in the short existence of this program, many of the activities have reaped some measure of student excellence, there are still strategies with certain target groups which need further attention.

The American Institutes for Research in their evaluation report made an overall conclusion of this as they say, "While this demonstration site comes closest to the 'total involvement' approach envisioned by the program's founder, it has not fully implemented the model."

The Chattanooga PUSH/Excel program thus, then, has an unfinished agenda which like many other State and local programs may not survive without continued assistance at the Federal level. As the staff continues to plan and work, efforts will be directed toward improved strategies for the following five expanded goals.

No. 1, to work more effectively with target students who have been identified as chronic absentees, chronic failures, and serious discipline problems.

Two, to assist the school staffs in developing techniques for students to become more responsible for planning and deciding on realistic future goals and careers.

Three, to provide instruction and support for parents on how to organize for supervised study time for their children at home.

Four, to develop more effective strategies for community involvement, including specific directions for business and industry, churches, community organizations, recreational centers, and the public media.

And five, to plan orientation for parent and community groups about the public education system with emphasis on how to get their concerns heard, their needs met, in the interest of a better education for their children.

We believe that the program objectives and strategies which attempt to include all facets of community support will come closest to the ultimate goal of providing a wholesome learning environment and a quality instructional environment for the less fortunate young citizens of this Nation. And we believe, further and finally, that the leaders of the Federal Government have not only the responsibility of continued financial support in these endeavors but also the right and the responsibility to monitor and evaluate the extent to which the funds are serving its purpose and achieving its goals. Thank you.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Dr. Hendrix. The chairman has had to step away and I have assumed the Chair. I feel a close affinity with all three of you. Ten years of my life were spent in education. The last 17 years I have been in a long sabbatical working at legislative work, so I personally welcome all of you here this morning.

Our next witness is Dr. Paul Loughran, assistant superintendent, Mahopac Central School District, New York.

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. LOUGHRAN, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, MAHOPAC CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, NEW YORK

Dr. LOUGHRAN. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members. It is indeed a pleasure to be here. Remind me never to follow the son of a preacher man again.

Much to-do has been made concerning specific characteristics in the literature that contribute to school success. A review of the current research concerning school effects reveals anywhere from 5 to 10 major characteristics which are important, but in my opinion not as important as the assessment and planning process which should grow from an awareness of these particular characteristics.

Research in general has an inflammatory effect on staff, both administrative and teaching, who view themselves as working in the trenches. The assessment, planning, and implementation process is really where the future focus of Federal aid to local districts should be. More attention should be paid to the personal characteristics specific to effect instructional leaders, and his/her role as catalysts in the improvement of instruction.

With declining enrollments and budget cuts the principalship has become a much more crucial position. If he or she cannot develop creative responses to shrinking resources and enrollments, substantial program development will cease. The principal also has to be organized to the point that effective followthrough and staff evaluation will take place as part of the implementation process for all instructional programs. The ability of the instructional leader to select capable staff is most important since few positions are being created. Evaluation of school effectiveness has to include the perceptions of the parents and community.

School climate is critical in producing a quality educational product. However, professional responsibilities mandate that staff rise above bureaucratic paper flow and systemic situations due to the special nature and missions of schools.

The institutions have a responsibility to provide as paper free and as productive a climate as possible but the concern of the individual professional should and must be focused on their current charges. In the urban setting in particular personnel problems play a large role in the setting of poor climate. Paychecks that are not generated for 3 to 6 months, lost checks, slow hiring procedures, and cavalier attitudes toward staff all distract the professional from the task at hand. I might add that brief funding cycles and living from year to year on a grant has not been conducive to a healthy climate. In addition, pullout programs whether it be for remediation or for the education of the gifted and talented have not provided the articulation between specialist and classroom teacher that enables the professional to feel that they have control and total responsibility for the end product.

The role of the principal at the building level is critical in developing a productive climate. The ability to raise self esteem and good feelings concerning the school as a whole is a most difficult task considering the age, conditions, and lack of public support for teachers. Staff development efforts should be of a personal nature so that burnt-out teachers feel that they are capable of changing and influencing their environments. Obviously, these efforts have as their goal the improvement of educational quality.

Schools in all settings can be made more effective. It requires total commitment from a strong principal and dedicated staff. A formalized management and planning process is required to make the schools more effective. The most important characteristics include formalized curriculum on a grade-by-grade basis with specific objectives for all content areas and an expectation that progress be made not only with each child but also with the school as a whole. This planning process should involve administrators, teachers, and parent representatives.

Program design is and should be the total responsibility of the principal and he or she should seek input from all levels so that the staff and community feel that they have the ability to influence institutional goals and structure. Money alone does not solve educational programs and problems. Commitment and a fresh perspective toward program design can solve many if not all of curriculum dilemmas. Effective and efficient test reporting is absolutely vital not only for superior instruction but for setting and analyzing school priorities. Many school resources are misdirected, and in many cases remedial target populations have been selected over the years based on unsophisticated data.

Instructional positions in the past have been more a function of funding source and organizational pattern rather than demonstrated need. The instructional leader cannot make meaningful instructional designs unless he has at his fingertips a concise summary of where the pupils are at by class and grade level. In this age it is ludicrous to have teacher-generated achievement and criterion-referenced test data when computer-generated formats are so readily available and inexpensive.

Instructional materials comprise at best 1 to 2 percent of school budgets and especially at the upper grades where more independent learning takes place it seems incredible that the most appropriate texts, tests, and media are generally not available. In social studies in particular, the area of Afro-Asian studies, materials are out of date on an almost yearly basis. It is inappropriate for schools to have as many as 10 basal readers per building due solely to a lack of analysis and planning, especially in light of the relatively insignificant funding required.

As enrollments shrink, personnel costs go through the roof due to seniority hiring and average experience. The age of the typical teacher in New York is currently in their forties, and salaries are commensurate. Therefore, more effective instructional materials and planning should lend themselves to far more efficient educational systems.

Last, the impact of the computer, both micro and CAI-CMI formats, cannot be overstated. As a recordkeeping device and instructional tool for use by the teacher, they provide superior instructional formats in drill and practice and criterion-referenced test reporting. Hopefully, computer software authors will soon catch up with hardware manufacturers.

It is important for the youngest elementary pupils to have a certain degree of computer literacy because they will coerce—yes, coerce—teachers in the upper grades, especially mathematics teachers, to become computer literate. Planning grants and instructional formats utilizing computers could be one means of introducing staff to them in a nonthreatening manner. I have witnessed burnt-out staff come to life with the addition of each.

The need for superior communication skills is vital to the success of the instructional leader and his or her programs. In many ways they have to promote and market educational concepts, and indeed, in the future, in the near future, this could be a prime characteristic.

The Federal Government's role in facilitating quality education and successful schools should rely on catalyst and planning models and not rely, as in the past, on compensatory programs. A need exists for tightly defined curricula and programs in which expectations are placed at all teaching and administrative levels. The Federal Government can best meet its responsibilities to the schools by providing voluntary planning grants for district and schoolwide programs designed to meet the needs of the entire population rather than a fragmented tourniquet approach as in the funded programs of the past.

Grants should be available to schools that voluntarily request help in needs assessment, attitudinal change, curricula structure and implementation. No sure cures exist and mandated cures only make people hostile. A change process takes a minimum of 3 years to complete and Federal grants should support this planning process and not supplant instructional moneys which should rely on local resources.

The benefits of these grants would accrue to all concerned, pupils, teachers, administrators, and the institution as a whole. Schools should be exciting places for all concerned. The talents and skills necessary to provide instructional leadership are many. It has been this author's experience that with appropriate support administrators can have an enormous effect on unproductive school situations. Thank you.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much, Dr. Loughran. I'll start questions in reverse order since you raised a point here that fits in with some testimony the subcommittee heard yesterday.

You mentioned that in many cases remedial target populations have been selected over the years based upon unsophisticated data—I'm reading from your testimony here. Yesterday Ronald Edmonds, formerly of Harvard, now of Michigan State University, indicated that perhaps we should consider title I on the basis of students' test results rather than on their familial profile or poverty level.

He also indicated, however—if I can recall—that this probably would not significantly change the population of students who were being served. Would you care to comment on whether we might use another method of identifying those to be served? Maybe all three of you could comment on that.

Dr. **Loughran**. Certainly my colleagues from the more directly urban situation might comment on that more directly, but I think my point was made that—I mean, what do tests measure, the way the testing programs are currently conducted? Generally it's a teacher-generated test. Excuse me, it's a validated test, but it's run in a typical classroom. In many cases, in most cases, it's teacher scored. Certain scoring errors can creep in. I think testing conditions on the whole, I think that the educational community throughout the country perhaps could use a great deal more inservice in regards to the manner in which tests should be given. And also the statistical formats. How are these summarized? Quite frankly, in my current position I came into a situation where each school ran its own testing program. One administrator or a staff would use percentiles or create equivalents, and there was no comparability of data. And the first thing I did was to computerize it all, and quite frankly, the data that was generated was totally different than community expectations. There was a perception that remedial math programs were in great need: just not a fact. I mean, the pupils are achieving, and I really think the analysis, the data has to be available, appropriate or accurate data has to be available before any meaningful decisions can be made. Unfortunately, I've seen very, very few instances where test programs have been that tightly constructed. Certainly similar comments could be made concerning the applicability of title I guidelines.

Mr. KILDEE. Dr. Edwards.

Dr. EDWARDS. Mr. Kildee, if I might respond to what I think was one part of your question, title I moneys—maybe this is the part that I want to respond to—but a matter of the identification of title I youth and how moneys or the strategies for following these youth up with money, I certainly hesitate to mention voucher systems and so forth. But if we could imagine in the public sector, in public education, a form of a voucher that would follow that title I qualified youngster, qualified from the standpoint of income as well as qualified from the standpoint of need for educational remediation, identifying that youngster and granting him a voucher that could be used at any school, this would be a way of generating respect for that youngster. It's partly what happens in the private school. When you come to the schoolhouse with the big buck the school has cause to make use of that big buck.

Now, I would hate to have anyone go from here extrapolating from what I've said that I support a voucher system. I'm speaking of moneys for public education and for youngsters who have need of it rather than moneys as we've spent in the past, where districts have reluctantly received maybe title I moneys and then used those moneys for purposes other than that child who fully qualified. Thereby, if the youngster goes to school on this side of the track or the other side of the track, the people on what is perceived to be the proper side of the track as well will generate respect for that youngster because he brings the buck with him, and then they'll call it. The failure in much of title I has been the fact that the buck is put out here by the Federal Government but they're negligent in their monitoring of how that buck has been spent. How much of the buck is spent on that youngster, how much of it is spent on this corporate executive who complains that we are spending too much Federal money for education, how much of this buck was spent actually on his designs or his strategies that he claimed that he would sell to the school system.

Mr. Kildee. Dr. Hendrix?

Dr. Hendrix. Just very briefly, I think I would have some reservations about judging eligibility of title I funds for youngsters based primarily on test data. I think it would be worthy of considering a combination of that and poverty or income as a matter of looking more closely at eligibility.

Mr. Kildee. Dr. Edmonds indicated yesterday that he didn't think the students who would be served would change much because the problems in the home attendant to poverty do create educational problems which would be reflected in the test scores.

Dr. Hendrix. There is a definite correlation; yes.

Mr. Kildee. So he was suggesting that maybe more or less as a selling point for the program rather than as something that would substantially change the population that would be served. In Michigan we have a program called chapter 3 which works in conjunction with title I. There is testing involved in chapter 3 which, again, results in the same basic population being served.

The President has proposed a rather significant cut in the amount of dollars for title I. In the reconciliation bill, the House and Senate agreed to fund title I at $3,480,000,000, and the House appropriated close to that, $3,200,000,000. But the President now recommends in his second round of cuts that that $3,200,000,000 be cut to $2,474,000,000. Could you comment on what the effect of that might be? The reason I ask this is that we've gleaned from most other witnesses in their school districts about one-third of the Federal dollars which they receive are for title I. Would you care to comment on what the effect might be on those programs in your schools?

Dr. Edwards. Certainly in the East Cleveland District we would suffer some severe loss. Many of the special designs that I have mentioned to you or special help for teachers, curriculum specialists, special remedial progr[illegible] in reading and mathematics, the State funding certainly is fo[illegible]sic programs. These specialized efforts we have had to look to Federal money and even to private foundations. I expect that this year we will receive about $500,000 in title I money. In 1978 when we initiated many of these programs we were receiving in excess of $1,300,000 of title I money.

We have found it desirable to accelerate these programs to serve more youngsters and at a time that we are receiving less in money. Not only is there the money from title I, the facts of the Federal Government's concern as expressed through even the limited amount of moneys that we received in the past, has suggested something to teachers and administrators, that this is a form of a Marshall plan, an endorsement by the Federal Government that education is important. You have to be mindful of the fact of the climate, the attitudes that are being created now when the Federal Government wanes in this responsibility, at least in this caring. There goes forth the mindset that education really might not be that important. So we will suffer.

Mr. Kildee. Dr. Loughran, do you care to comment on that?

Dr. Loughran. I am currently not in a situation that would be heavily affected, quite frankly. In my previous position in New York City, obviously, there was a tremendous impact and as you can tell from my statement, I guess from my experiences in New

York City and now in a suburban rural district, I feel that whether it be title I or any other funding source, that the help really should be of a planning and management nature, of focusing on solving problems but not directly providing instructional services. I just feel that very deeply.

Now, obviously, it has great implications. In New York State yesterday we had an overturn of our local State property tax situation for the support of the schools and obviously it's going to be a very bloody battle. It has taken many years and my district happens to be a part of that lawsuit against the State to force a change in the taxation, and philosophically I have to say that, you know, I believe that the Federal role should be one of planning, helping with management, but not supplanting instruction. So I guess I really wouldn't be in agreement with everybody at this particular table.

Mr. Kildee. Dr. Hendrix.

Dr. Hendrix. I guess we would feel that to make that type of cut in the title I funds would seem to contradict the theory that we've had that there indeed are a number of school systems, a number of youngsters, who are so far behind that that so-called extra layer is not only needed but is most essential if, not so much that they're going to catch up, but they're going to keep from getting further and further behind. It seems to me that if there is a great concern as it relates to money for the title I program that the emphasis ought to be on trying to find a way to determine if States and school systems are indeed putting the best use to the money and getting the best results that can be achieved. That in a sense might seem to suggest that we are talking about more Federal control but it's been my thought that funds, whether they're title I or whatever, that there is a responsibility at the Federal level and a need to make sure that the funds are put to good use and have school systems and States be able to document that they indeed are put to good use.

Mr. Kildee. Let me ask this, and I mean it objectively, although I have to use a term that might open me to the charge of subjectivity.

Among your school population, would you consider your title I students among those whom you would deem to be more truly needy?

Dr. Edwards. I think I'm missing your point.

Mr. Kildee. My point is that the administration, in fiscally and philosophically changing the direction of Government in many areas including education, has assured us that they would somehow provide some type of protection for those who are truly needy. Education certainly is a need. Would you consider your title I students to be those who are in greater need, perhaps, than others?

Dr. Edwards. I would have to say absolutely so. Do I consider the title I students more in need than——

Mr. Kildee. You would consider them among the more needy of your students?

Dr. Edwards. Very much so. The identification process results in just that. They are the—what is the terminology in Washington now?—the truly needy, the title I—if I'm understanding you correctly.

Mr. Kildee. Yes. We have true needs, we have——

Dr. **Edwards**. The methodology for identification would suggest that they are the truly needy.

Mr. **Kildee**. We have been told that there is supposed to be a safety net for those who have have need of housing, education, and nutrition. We think of education as something that a person has a right to and we try especially to aid people that are more needy than others. You would indicate that the title I students certainly are very needy?

Dr. **Edwards**. Very much so.

Dr. **Hendrix**. I'd say they need it second only to handicapped. Certain handicapped students certainly are the most needy in many of our areas and many of our programs. So next to that would be the title I students.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much. The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the gentlemen for being with us today.

This is referring primarily to title I, because both yesterday's and today's witnesses have mentioned that pullout programs are counterproductive if the reality of strict Federal audits forces many local officials to resort to such pullout techniques to insure what they call a clean audit trail.

Doesn't it make more sense to allow local officials to design programs to assist those students with special needs without the threat of such strict audit requirements? Coming down to my final point, it seems that strict audit procedures often result in the displacement of goals. In other words, the goal becomes to have a successful audit rather than to create a program. And if any or all of you wish to comment on that, I think it would be helpful to the committee. Volunteer. Go right ahead, please.

Dr. **Loughran**. That has been a major concern, certainly, in New York City as well as in some of the suburban situations. I think, obviously, the audit trail is the most important function and has to be provided, but the impact, the negative impact on instruction of the pullout programs I think is overwhelming. One of the major problems is that after several years it really leads to a situation where accountability, responsibility, planning does not take place by the classroom teacher for that particular need. And whether it be for a compensatory situation in reading and math or for a gifted and talented situation, whatever it may be, the planning and articulation between pullout specialist and classroom teacher for the most part does not take place and we feel that you're really supplanting instruction in many cases.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Anyone else wish to comment? Dr. Edwards or Dr. Hendrix?

Dr. **Edwards**. I would simply say that I believe that the pullout programs can be effective. Certainly we are showing tremendous gains in such designs as tutorial reading under title I. I heard you mention the concern about audits. And I think that certainly auditing of programs and auditing of accounts must be had and is very important, but some of past guidelines that have come in have certainly caused persons to be somewhat overly conscious, maybe, of the auditing process and giving too much time and attention to that over against time of actually program implementation and success of program. This is not to discredit auditing at all.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much.

Dr. **Hendrix**. I guess the only comment I want to make is just from the standpoint of my school system and from what curriculum people in my district say. And that is the fact that the pullout program has been successful in that it accomplishes for teachers the opportunity to get those students for a period of time to give more concentrated instruction. And actually, at the classroom teacher level they don't get concerned about audit to that extent. Their role is to try to work with the students in their individual needs, so I guess I don't see it as that big of a problem though I do recognize the concern that you've raised.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much. Several words came through, I think, from all three of you today, relating to this whole idea of enrichment, motivation, creativity. Dr. Hendrix, you emphasized that a broad involvement of just about everybody seems to be one of the keys to really having a good program, to get the community, teachers, principals, students, business/professional people, the churches, other people, involved. It seems to me, also, if you look at the whole program and these examples of successful programs in large cities in typical areas, it seems oftentimes that children, and maybe not only children, tend to rise to the level of our expectations. I think this is one of the things that you've done successfully is to expect achievement, expect discipline, expect performance, and I think it is apparent to one who has been involved at least legislatively in education for a long time, I think those are things that pay dividends.

A question for Dr. Edwards. I guess I'll put it in a pretty blunt and direct way, because you mentioned it as an important part of your program. How do you get rid of an incompetent tenured teacher?

Dr. **Edwards**. I knew after I raised that point that I would get that question. Let me assure you it's not the easiest——

Mr. **Erdahl**. I guess, as an aside, how do you deal with teachers' federation, the NEA or your teacher groups. How do you cope?

Dr. **Edwards**. Let me assure you that we don't just go out every day and try to find incompetent teachers to get rid of. We have designs for helping to make mediocre teachers into better teachers, and better teachers into even better teachers than that. And the designs I've mentioned to you, curriculum specialists and the principal as an instructional leader, all of these designs are keyed to helping people to be successful, raising their expectations of themselves and secondarily raising the expectations of their students.

When all of that fails, we must as administrators in education as we would in the corporate sector make a decision that we have to change the human resources, if that is the problem. And we do. Now we have nontenured teachers, throughout the Nation. When we have helped them all we can, and they're not able to perform, we can, if we document our efforts to help them, we can get rid of them. Many superintendents and school boards fail to do so because they do not care to go through the community hassle of getting rid of such persons. We simply, after all help, we indicate the persons and we document our case and say that they must. I would have to admit that in my 5 years in East Cleveland I've been in court seven times on such cases. On tenured teachers——

Mr. **Erdahl**. But you're still there so that must have been successful.

Dr. **Edwards**. Seven times in court can take up a lot of time, because there's a lot of preparation for it. But I think the heart of it all is that the administrator must stand on his feet and be an administrator and decide that this is best for the young people, this is best for the community, even though it's going to cause me a problem, it's going to cause some community concerns and certainly concern some unions. I must make a decision and that is more important than whether or not my contract is going to be renewed another year.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much. I'm not sure if it was——

Mr. **Kildee**. If I could, maybe——

Mr. **Erdahl**. Certainly I yield at that point.

Mr. **Kildee** [continuing]. Dialog with you on that. Having taught for 10 years and having gone through the records of the tenure commission in Michigan, I have discovered that school districts that seem to have a better record of getting rid of the incompetent teacher had administrators who were willing to take time to document the incompetence, just like a prosecutor going into court has to present a good case. Administrators can't simply go in and say, this teacher isn't cutting the mustard. Good documentation generally was sufficient to get rid of an incompetent teacher. Principals or superintendents who go before the tenure commission with undocumented complaints are not as successful. A prosecutor who presents such evidence would have his case thrown out of court. I do think that very often in the past superintendents have just been unwilling or unable—to document their cases. Cases containing documentation of incompetence usually prevail before the tenure commission in Michigan. A lot of teachers have been dismissed because of incompetence, if the case is well prepared.

Mr. **Erdahl**. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would assume, also, that when these events happen that they might be traumatic for the administrator and the teacher and others involved. But it does have a psychological impact on the other teacher, because, I think, oftentimes, the fellow teachers probably recognize the incompetence, sometimes, maybe before the principal or the superintendent. I think sometimes the kids detect this first of all.

Another question or comment. Again, I'm not sure who brought this to us, and it came up yesterday in the testimony as well, is using the school time in a productive way, spending the time teaching. Someone mentioned less time in the hallway or on the parking lot. How do you really accomplish that and get the kids involved in more creative activities than sometimes happen in the hallways or in the parking lots? I think maybe, Mr. Edwards, I think you were the one that mentioned it. I'm not sure. And any of you could respond.

Dr. **Edwards**. I'll be very happy to start the response. We hear in the literature now, let's hope it's not jogging time on task, how much time do we spend on certain tasks that we have prioritized to be of importance, of significance, even, to the accomplishment of the school's goal? Yes, we waste a lot of time in schools. We waste a lot of time because we have not programed, we have not strategized and have not prioritized that which is important. We waste time in high schools in simply passing, or waste time in getting started in classes, we waste time on what I might call trivial subject matter. Time on task is a real issue in my district. We are concentrating heavily on mathematics and reading. Not that we do not think that science and social studies and the other skill disciplines are important, but we want to do much of even those through reading and mathematics, let's say the language arts. And therefore we have prioritized those tasks as being very important, even the time of day that they are taught. No teacher in East Cleveland elementary schools should be found teaching mathematics, unless you just want to add something to it, at 2:30 in the afternoon. It should be taught in the morning, and when youngsters are fresh. Let's do physical education as much as we can in the afternoon. That is a matter of prioritizing time.

Teachers have a tendency to teach that which they feel most competent in, and therefore we have to give them help in teaching those disciplines, not just those that they are interested in, but those that are very, very important to the success of the school's program.

Key to all of that is that people—and I'm certain that Ron Edmonds mentioned this yesterday—all of us in the schoolhouse, whether it's teachers and principals and all—planning and knowing exactly what our mission is, what our goals are, what we hope to accomplish, curriculum guidelines that we're going to relate to, and we know, one, from one grade to another what we are teaching; curriculum or curricula articulation, what I might call it, and understanding that thoroughly.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Please go ahead, sir.

Dr. **Loughran**. I just wanted to comment that time on task for pupils is also time on task for teachers as well, and I don't know whether the educational community or the public at large understand the rising costs as much as someone who is in charge of personnel in the district. Our average teacher in New York is about 44, our average salary in the suburban rural situation I'm in now is $28,000 a year plus fringe, which works out to a little over $40,000 a year per teacher. And in the past, when teachers were perhaps less expensive, one wasn't as concerned with pull-out programs and specialists and all that, but when your average staff member is costing you $43,000 a year it's a big concern, especially when, as you lose 4 percent of your elementary population each year, and now it's starting to hit the secondary schools, it's the less expensive teacher who leaves, due to seniority. So, as a result, your average age keeps increasing.

The only areas, quite frankly, that we have young teachers are in some of the newer areas like computer and special education. And so the public perception is that you can close the building, you save money. It's just not a fact because it's your older teachers who are staying and the cost factors just keep climbing. So we, as a district policy, are trying to take more advantage of the staff in terms of time on task instead of perhaps letting those 5, 10, or 15 minutes before school and after school slide. We've been able to negotiate into the contract after-school help, where teachers will stay for an hour and 20 minutes after school and work on planning and small group instruction et cetera. And it's the only way we see we'll be able to create new and more meaningful programs.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Dr. Hendrix, yes?

Dr. **Hendrix**. Yes, sir. Time on task in the Chattanooga system got to be an issue at the negotiations table, and rightly so, as teachers were concerned about all the interruptions caused by principals, but mainly interruptions caused by community groups. Everybody's got something that your kids should have that's of value to them and thus they make demands on the kids and the teachers.

So, as a result of this, we did make an agreement that uninterrupted time for instruction in the basic skills must be held to, and the other instructional areas, and then a certain portion of that time for the other kinds of things that might come up. So we do adhere to that. It's very much a concern in our system.

Dr. **Edwards**. Mr. Erdahl, if I might add?

Mr. **Erdahl**. Yes, sir, go ahead.

Dr. **Edwards**. Then the cruel thing that goes forth in public education—let's say, in education in this Nation, in that same regard—we have often middle-class-oriented teachers who decide for themselves, out of their own expectations and respect for the youth they teach. They make a decision that it might be a waste of my time to deal with certain disciplines and therefore I will deal with that which I believe that is more productive for these youngsters rather than what they will need.

I have a conference coming up soon of a teacher that we have questioned seriously about going to Australia every summer and coming back and spending, in a predominantly black school, spending a half or a quarter in social studies on Australia. Not that Australia's not important but for the youngsters in my district there are a lot of places a lot more important to them than what she discovered in Australia. And so I might be back in court again.

Mr. **Erdahl**. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you, Mr. Erdahl. Education is a different type of profession. Everyone's an expert on education. Unlike medicine where, you don't have a lot of community groups suggesting a better way of doing an appendectomy, but everyone is, in a sense, an expert in education. While it might be confusing the community is always going to be involved in education and making suggestions about how we can better educate. As a matter of fact, the Congress has played a role in having advisory councils of parents set up to advise educators. Someone has once said that education is too important to be left to educators alone. I always make sure they add the "alone" because, being a professional educator, I think it is very important. We are one profession where the parent, the student, and the public provide input. We are different than other professions and other disciplines, because we do get advice from all sides.

Are any of you aware of any longitudinal studies of the effectiveness of title I or chapter 3 on those students who participated in the programs, in elementary school?

Dr. **Loughran**. No, I'm not.

Dr. **Edwards**. I can't quote studies that have been scientifically conducted by learned organizations or societies. I could only say that there must be programs, there are programs in school systems which have worked that certainly have been deemed effective through objective measurements that those several school districts have used.

I have been acquainted for a number of years with the Richmond, Va., public school system, and I have found many programs that were effective there, and I can quote those also in East Cleveland.

Mr. KILDEE. At a time like this when we find draconian cuts in funding being proposed to a program that I think all three of you would feel has in some way helped develop effective education, some type of objective study would be very helpful in defending the programs.

Visiting schools regularly and looking at neighborhood groups, I have observed subjectively the effectiveness of this program. It might be something that some group would study to get us some objective data about how these programs have affected the learning of children.

Dr. EDWARDS. Mr. Kildee, this is a form of the serious monitoring that I called for from the department of education or from the Federal Government. I'd first of all demonstrate the belief in what we are doing when we are spending Federal dollars by following up and insisting upon having evaluations and studies made by such organizations.

Mr. KILDEE. For the most part the bulk of these dollars have been concentrated in urban school areas. Are there some things that we have learned through title I, that could be replicated in rural and more affluent suburban schools?

Dr. LOUGHRAN. Yes, I'd just like to comment on that for a moment. I didn't mean to give the impression before that, when I mentioned that I really am not supportive of the pullout concept at this particular time, that I didn't think that title I was successful. Obviously, with the size and scope of the programs in New York City, there are many, many, many instances of programs which are viewed as being highly successful, not just with pupils but also with the staff impact, teacher training.

We have a program, the title I high school reading program which is perhaps $12 million, $13 million. It's probably the biggest reading program in the country involving over 100 high schools, and it's a prescriptive, diagnostic format, basically a pullout, but at the secondary level it's, you know, with scheduling everything is pullout, basically.

And in local districts I know of many, many of the programs that are successful. The point I want to make is that, for where we're at now, with shrinking resources and given the success of the new program in Congress, the new budget, I think the reality states that perhaps pullouts are not the best situation and that the best use of the money that is available or that will be available could be for planning and for inservice.

I know the formats that I described in my talk really to a large degree grow out of formats that were developed under title I. So I would be most emphatic in stating that many, many of the programs have been successful.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you for clarifying that. At this point I will call upon counsel for the majority for any questions he may have.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Loughran, you made the statement that the governmental role should be to rely on catalysts and planning models, and not rely, as in the past, on compensatory programs. And then, further down in that same statement, the same paragraph, you say Federal grants should support the planning process and not supplant instructional moneys which should rely on local resources. Are you making a comment on the Federal role in terms of instruction and its supplementive moneys for instruction? I'm not sure what your point is.

Dr. LOUGHRAN. I think the point there is that in the daily press of business there is certainly a fine line between supplanting instruction and supplemental instruction, and that I think at this point, with limited resources, it's more important to focus on planning and helping to structure the curricula, perhaps, rather than participating in the pullout programs that have been discussed. I don't know if that clarifies it?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILDEE. Does the counsel for the minority have any questions? Apparently not.

I want to thank you for your presentation this morning. We are at certainly a fiscal turning point in the Federal role vis-a-vis the State and local delivery systems of education, and perhaps at a philosophical turn in the road as well. We want to make sure that the programs the Federal Government does put into place are programs that are needed and effective. I am not original in this statement, but certainly education is, and should remain, a local function. It is primarily a State responsibility, but it is and will remain a deep Federal concern if for no other reason because of the mobility of the people in our society. People educated in Michigan may spend a part of their career in Alabama, a part in Oregon, and a part in Arizona. We do have a strong Federal concern for education which cannot be ignored. Although liberals, conservatives and people of various philosophical bents will argue about what the involvement of the Federal Government should be, we cannot ignore the fact that there are national concerns which the Federal Government must address. It is for this reason that we have these hearings; to insure that we are aware of national concerns and are advised about how we might best respond to national concerns and needs.

I want to thank you for helping us in that.

[The hearing was adjourned at 11:10 a.m. on October 28, 1981.]

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON URBAN EDUCATION

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1981

House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor,

Los Angeles, Calif.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 8:35 a.m., in the Muses Room, Museum of Science and Industry, 700 State Drive, Exposition Park, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Hawkins, Miller, and Kildee.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, majority counsel, and Jennifer Vance, minority senior legislative associate.

Mr. **Hawkins**. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is called to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is one of a series of hearings on the subject of education, particularly as it is related to urban education. I am the acting chairman today, may I say, by courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who is also the chairman of the subcommittee.

I am delighted to welcome to Los Angeles today, on behalf of the subcommittee, our distinguished colleagues, on the far right, Mr. Kildee of Michigan, and on my left, Mr. George Miller of California. To my immediate right is the chairman of the full committee. It is a great pleasure for us to have Chairman Perkins present because Mr. Perkins is one of the Members of Congress who seldom travels. He will travel from Washington to his district in Kentucky, where he is a great champion of his district in the field of education, particularly vocational education. More recently he has distinguished himself in terms of his opposition to the education cuts. So it is an unusual pleasure to have the chairman of the full committee with us today, and at this point I will yield to him for any remarks that he may care to make.

Congressman Carl Perkins of the State of Kentucky.

Mr. **Perkins**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I visited here when Max Rafferty was State school superintendent around 1964. I am very much impressed with the changes that have taken place since that time. I stayed in the same hotel last night that I stayed in back in 1964. The change in this great city complex and these tall buildings is amazing. The tallest building that I could see here in 1964 was the Hilton Hotel. Now I look around the place and see the Bank of America and all these other

87

tall buildings and it makes me think that you are representing one of the greatest areas of the whole world.

During hearings in Washington on October 27 and 28, we heard excellent testimony on effective urban programs which have resulted in significant academic gains for their school populations. In addition, we received testimony calling for a strong and continued commitment from the Federal Government in education.

I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that it is a real pleasure for me to be able to come to Los Angeles to participate in this hearing. I appreciate this opportunity to get a closer look at the educational needs, problems, and accomplishments of this great city.

I would also like to commend my colleague, Gus Hawkins, for initiating these hearings. Mr. Hawkins has been one of the most able members of our committee during his tenure in Congress and a true friend of education. In addition, Mr. Hawkins is probably the most respected leader in the House. I feel honored to serve with him in the Congress.

Your State has also sent us in Washington another excellent Member of Congress, George Miller. Mr. Miller is one of the most respected younger leaders in Congress, and I can predict with absolute certainty, based on his record so far, that he has a brilliant future ahead of him.

We are also joined today by our colleague, Dale Kildee, who has also distinguished himself in Congress for his expertise and concern in all matters affecting education.

This morning we have scheduled panels of witnesses representing a broad spectrum of educational and community groups. We look to hear testimony to provide us with an understanding of the educational needs and problems of the Los Angeles area. I would also like to hear your views on how the Federal Government can facilitate school effectiveness in urban areas. As you know, the President has proposed a greatly diminished Federal role in education. We would be interested in hearing your views on the impact of the administration's budget and legislative proposals on your city's efforts to provide quality education.

The hearing testimony will, in my judgment, prove to be a valuable resource in the subcommittee's deliberations on how to support education for youngsters in our large cities.

And let me say I am delighted to meet so many educational leaders here this morning that Mr. Hawkins has asked to be present.

In conclusion, let me state that of all the accomplishments of Gus Hawkins in the Congress, I hardly feel that the people in this whole area realize what he has meant to you over a period of years. He is such a deserving legislator that nothing that you people could do in this country could ever repay him for his services. He stays on the job all the time. I personally would like to see, some day—Gus and I are getting up there in years——

Mr. HAWKINS. Just you, Carl.

Mr. PERKINS. See this great city name this museum and this beautiful rose garden after Gus Hawkins. I think he deserves that kind of a tribute. [Applause.]

I want to say a word about my other colleagues here this morning.

I have had experience serving with hundreds of Members in the Congress. I came to the Congress when Truman was elected in 1948, and took the oath on January 3, 1949, a youngster in that day and time. We had coalitions in the Congress. We had a coalition that was organized against civil rights legislation, and we didn't completely break that up until about the year 1965. But I took pride in being the first Congressman from the South that ever voted for a civil rights law in those days, and I am so proud of it.

But with the progress that we have been making over a period of years, I hate to see us lose the momentum that we have gained in the way of these legislative proposals to cut back on education and other necessary social programs.

When George Miller came to the Congress—about 1972, I presume, you could tell from day 1 that he was one of the outstanding young Members in the U.S. Congress. He has served his district ably and everybody respects him for his leadership. He is on the committee that I happen to chair, and when George Miller wrestles with a problem, anybody else can forget about it because he always goes to the bottom of the problem and works for the correct solution which is for the welfare of the people in the district that he represents in the United States.

I think his district is a little north of here, but all Californians can be proud of George Miller and Gus Hawkins.

I want to say something about the gentleman here on my right who is with us this morning, Dale Kildee. He comes from a Michigan area where you have tremendous automobile plants and, of course, he has seen a lot of unemployment in that area, his own area. But on all occasions, he has been a quarterback with George Miller in the Congress. They came about the same time. They have worked together all the time.

We have all strived to improve educational opportunities in this country for all the people, and we are still trying to do that. We are trying to do it today to find out what we can do in the urban areas, and Dale Kildee has worked with us every inch of the way and is, likewise, one of the great leaders in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say. You have your witnesses organized, so you just go to it and call them.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose, as you have been told, of the hearing today is to continue to look into the effective programs that have operated successfully in various areas of the country and also within the ghetto areas where many have said effective schools could not be created.

The committee has listened more recently to educators in Washington who have testified as to the viability of the public education system. We know that the system itself is under attack. We know that there are some problems with it, but this committee, more than any other committee in the Congress, has spearheaded the drive to improve and to protect the public education system.

The committee is very mindful of the attacks that have been made, the threats that exist today, and we believe that through these hearings the public will be correctly informed about what is going on, and also the Congress will be able to understand the effectiveness that has been achieved in the public education system in this country, perhaps the greatest institution on the American scene, and we are determined that it not be undermined and that it will remain as a great force in American life.

The various witnesses have been selected on the basis of those who occupy key positions in which decisions are going to be made locally. Before the end of the day, however, community persons as well as others will be heard from, even though they may not be scheduled, and if you will be patient with us, if the witnesses will try to confine their remarks to the highlights of their prepared statements, I think we can accommodate every individual who wants to say something in this area.

We can assure you that all of the statements, however, whether given orally or not, will be in the official record of this hearing, so nothing will be lost.

At this time I will be glad to yield to either one of my distinguished colleagues if either one of them would care to make a statement. Mr. Miller? Mr. Kildee?

They have politely declined. I am sure we will be hearing from them throughout the day.

The first panel of witnesses, then, will be called and may be seated at the witness table, Dr. Harry Handler, superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District; and Ms. Rita Walters, a member of the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education.

Dr. Handler and Board Member Walters, kindly be seated at the witness table.

May I ask of the audience in the meantime whether or not the microphones are transmitting the meeting successfully? If not, at any time just raise your hand and we will adjust the system.

Dr. Handler, I suppose we will call on you first, as listed, and after you have given your statement, then Ms. Walters, and then both of you will be asked to answer what questions the members may have. It is a pleasure to have both of you as the leadoff witnesses today. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HARRY HANDLER, SUPERINTENDENT, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. HANDLER. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: Since you have my testimony in written form, I shall present only a brief synopsis at this time.

First, may I indicate our sincere admiration and gratitude for the leadership which Representative Perkins has given in this field of Federal involvement in education over a period of almost two decades.

May I also acknowledge our gratitude to Representative Hawkins, whose vigorous support of the Los Angeles Unified School District has served as an inspiration to this community.

Briefly, some characteristics of our district for those who may not be aware of them: We are the second largest district in the Nation. We cover 650 mainland square miles. We have over 540,000 students, almost 60,000 employees, we have a steady growth of Hispanic and Asian students, and more than 100,000 of our students are in year-round programs because many of our schools are overcrowded.

You asked that we respond to four questions. The first question dealt with effective school programs and effective schools.

Briefly, we support and we can document that it does work, the research findings of significance that have been reported to this committee. Effective schools require strong educational leadership, strong administrators at the school level, high expectations for students held by teachers and the staff, formalized learning structures, a focus on basic skills, and frequent monitoring of pupil progress.

We would also add that it is important that schools be able to provide health services, food services, reasonable class size, appropriate instructional materials, a secure and wholesome learning environment, and provisions for parent support and involvement.

In regard to the question related to school behavior—and as I indicated, more information is in the document I submitted—we are concerned that what appears to be a national indifference toward the value of education. We are concerned about the continuing deterioration of public support for schools. We are concerned about the attitudes and values that some of our students bring to school.

We believe that students must come to school aware of their responsibility to learn, but we also believe that children cannot learn in a climate of fear and anxiety. School campuses must be places where students are physically safe and emotionally secure, and as you probably know, our district spends over $11 million annually for school security, and because of our limited resources we have a maintenance backlog of over $200 million.

Instructionally effective schools for poor children was the third item on your list. We prefer to speak of children with special learning needs. We believe that we have thousands of outstanding young people in our district. Many of them do have unique instructional needs, either because of the lower economic areas, limited English speaking, physically handicapped or emotionally handicapped problems which they have at this time relative to learning within the present setting.

But we do believe that the same characteristics that I mentioned in response to question No. 1 apply to question No. 3, but there is a need for additional resources in order to provide the individualized and personalized kind of service that young people with special needs need.

You asked relative to the role of the Federal Government. We believe one of the critical roles of the Federal Government is to establish education as a priority, indeed a priority for our great Nation, and to assist in solving critical problems. An example of one of our critical problems at this time is the severe shortage of mathematics teachers. I recall when the Federal Government initiated a program as part of the National Defense Education Act which strengthened secondary instruction in mathematics. We need similar programs. We need help in vocational education so that our young people can keep abreast of rapid, complex, technological changes that are occurring.

But it seems incongruous for me to be talking about future needs when at this time the amount of support is being reduced, so permit me to take a moment to describe the effect of Federal reductions on the district at this time.

First, the fiscal 1981 supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill, Public Law 97-12, reduced elementary and education funding nationwide by $1 billion. The Los Angeles Unified School District's combined Federal programs, which had amounted to almost $194 million in 1980-81, were cut by $45 million. Because most Federal education programs are forward funded, the fiscal year 1981 reductions are reflected in our current 1981-82 school year.

The effects include: The immediate termination of 1,048 public service employees funded by CETA; a reduction of 40,000 in the number of library books to be purchased; a reduction of $8 million in food services support, causing a 20-percent reduction in the number of students who can afford to buy lunch, and the projected closing of the breakfast program in approximately 100 schools.

Mandated ticketing procedures will cost $2 million this year. That is enough to provide 2 million free lunches. The loss of the milk subsidy, about $1 million, is forcing many students to forgo this type of nutrition. A loss of Emergency School Aid Act funds has affected our magnet schools and special projects funds, resulting in the elimination of 136 teachers, 40 counselors, 100 teacher assistants, and 17 classified personnel.

These events have already occurred.

Next, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35, reduced the authorized levels of funding for Federal programs to conform to the budget limits set by Congress. These reductions amount to approximately $612 million nationwide, or 9 percent of the previous year's funding prior to the rescission. The provisions of the budget reconciliation bill include further cuts in the ESEA program, one that is critical to the district's voluntary integration program.

Although the appropriations measures currently being considered in both Houses provide almost $1 billion more for fiscal year 1982 funding than the administration requested, the ESEA title I concentration grant of particular importance for urban districts was eliminated. Our concentration grant for 1980-81 was $3.8 million.

Even more ominous is the President's September 24 request for a new round of reductions amounting to another $2 billion from elementary and secondary education. Assuming proportional reductions in the various programs involved, we anticipate an additional loss of $18 million. These figures do not, of course, reflect the additional impact of inflation.

The block-grant portion of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 would result in a partial solution for numerous problems faced by California's local school districts by eliminating many restrictive regulations and providing the flexibility necessary to meet those needs of students identified at the local level. On the other hand, this would mean further reductions in the funding of those discrete programs that are currently providing services to our students.

Nevertheless, we applaud Congress for excluding ESEA title I, Public Law 94-142 programs for the handicapped, bilingual education and vocational education from the block grant. Until Federal regulations have been promulgated and the State mechanism for determining the allocation of block-grant funds to school districts is implemented, we cannot foretell the precise fiscal impact on our district.

Finally, these factors do not augur well for public education in Los Angeles. Despite our critical financial problems, we are expected to provide even more individualized services to an ever-increasing population of students with special needs. Each new requirement encroaches upon the general fund of the district. The decisions being made now regarding public education will have a critical effect upon the future of our society.

My own personal feeling is that an investment in public education is an investment in national defense.

I appreciate your continuing interest in and support of public education, and thank you for the opportunity to share some of my thoughts with you.

[The prepared statement of Harry Handler follows:]

Prepared Statement of Dr. Harry Handler, Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: May I indicate our sincere admiration and gratitude for the leadership which Representative Perkins has given in this field of Federal involvement in education over a period of almost two decades.

May I also acknowledge our gratitude to Representative Hawkins, whose vigorous support of the Los Angeles Unified School District has served as an inspiration to this community.

My remarks today will be made in the context of the second largest school district in the United States which encompasses 650 mainland square miles, enrolls over 540,000 students in regular classes and special education and has almost 60,000 employees, over half of whom are certificated. Our enrollment pattern shows a steady growth of Hispanic and Asian pupils which has intensified the need to provide bilingual and bicultural programs. Because these new arrivals tend to locate in specific parts of the school district, many of our schools have become drastically overcrowded. We have been forced to place enrollment ceilings on some of our schools and transport new students to other school sites, some of which are a considerable distance away.

A final key factor affecting the status of our district is our financial situation. We are forced to make severe cuts in our educational programs yearly. Staff recruitment and morale are seriously affected by our inability to keep our employees abreast of the continually rising cost of living.

You invited us to share our views on four questions.

First, "Effective School Programs and Effective Schools"—We endorse the recent research which has pointed to the significance of strong educational leadership at the school level, high expectations among teachers and other staff members, formalized learning structures, focus on basic skills, and frequent monitoring of pupil progress as elements identifying effective school programs and effective schools. We would, however, wish to add our belief that factors related to supportive services; e.g., health services, food services, the matter of class size, the significance of appropriate instructional materials, and the assurance of a secure and wholesome learning environment are additional factors important to effective schools.

I should like to approach the topic of School Behavior first from a rather global perspective. I am concerned that there may prevail, nationally, an attitude of indifference toward the value of education. I believe this attitude has contributed to a continuing deterioration of public support for our schools. It affects significantly the attitudes and values that pupils bring to school. The very structure of public schools requires that pupils come to the school aware of their responsibility to learn. The development of this awareness is a primary obligation of parents.

There is abundant evidence that children cannot effectively learn in a climate characterized by fear and anxiety. Thus, in addition to assuring that school campuses are esthetically pleasant, we must be sure that they are places where students are physically safe and emotionally secure. In Los Angeles we spend over $11 million annually for school security and we have a maintenance backlog of over $302 million.

The Carnegie Foundation Report of over a year ago emphasized the importance, especially at the secondary school level, of providing learning opportunities other than the regular school setting for the student whose school behavior damaged not only that individual's learning progress, but also placed a handicap on the learning opportunities of others. In a nutshell, this means that when a child cannot function in an acceptable manner in a regular school setting, some other kind of learning opportunity must be made available.

The third item about which we have been invited to comment relates to "Instructionally Effective Schools for Poor Children." Let me suggest immediately that, rather than speak of "poor children," I would prefer to speak of children with special learning needs. Under this heading, I include children with unique instructional needs who are, in almost all cases, poor children, the non-English-speaking, the physically handicapped and the emotionally handicapped.

An instructionally effective school for children with special needs has all of the features which I described earlier related to effective school programs and effective schools. I would add an additional dimension. Children with special needs seem to require a significant amount of personalized attention and related resources.

It is my belief that, as we seek to balance our perception of the optimum characteristics of effective schools for children with special needs with the hard realities of diminishing resources available to public schools, we must request that federal and state agencies remove some of the rigid demands imposed upon us, all with good intent but which impose unattainable requirements.

Finally, the role of the federal government has been a major positive factor in the success of public education. In the coming decade, the federal government can continue to play a critical role in those areas where its involvement can provide focus and direction to address critical problems.

For example, in our district and, indeed, nationally, there exists a critical shortage of teachers of mathematics. The federal government could immediately initiate a program similar to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) which it sponsored in the late 50's and the 60's—programs which permitted us to provide stipends to teachers for summer training and retraining in critical fields. Some of you will remember the post-Sputnik era, when, in a very few years, secondary instruction in math, science, and foreign language was given a much needed shot in the arm by federal intervention through NDEA and other efforts.

Secondarily, the rapid and complex nature of technological change demands a continuing presence by the federal government in the area of vocational education. I see no resource other than the federal government to provide the continuing support required to keep abreast of the rapid technological changes that we are witnessing in industry and, in a more limited degree, in the field of business.

Having briefly noted a few specifics regarding the significance of federal involvement in education, let me point out the effect of some of the funding reductions which have already been made and those which have been proposed.

The first round came with the fiscal year 1981 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Bill, PL 97-12, which reduced funding for elementary and secondary education nationwide by $1 billion. In the Los Angeles Unified School District, our combined federal programs, which had amounted to almost $194 million in 1980–81 (Column 1 of Exhibit A), were cut by $45 million (Column 2 of Exhibit A). Because most federal education programs are forward funded, the fiscal year 1981 reductions are reflected in our current 1981–82 school year. The effects include:

Immediate termination of 1,048 public service employees funded by CETA.

Reduction of 40,000 in the number of library books to be purchased.

Reduction of $8 million in food services support causing a twenty percent reduction in the number of students who can afford to buy lunch and the projected closing of the breakfast program in approximately 100 schools. Mandated "ticketing" procedures will cost $2 million this year * * * that is enough to provide two million free lunches. The loss of the milk subsidy, about $1 million, is forcing many students to forego this type of nutrition.

A loss of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) magnet school funds causing the elimination of 32 education aides.

Reduction of ESAA special projects funds resulting in the elimination of 136 teachers, 40 counselors, 100 teacher assistants, 17 classified personnel and others.

Reduction or elimination of centralized services for numerous ESEA Title I components, including audio-visual, nursing coordination, counseling and psychological coordination, research and evaluation, computer-assisted instruction, and school-community relations (including 12 teacher positions).

Phaseout of over 1,300 opportunities in the in-school youth employment program, depriving many youth of the economic means needed to stay in school.

Reduction of vocational education resource teachers, instructional supplies and equipment.

As you know, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, PL 97-35, reduced the authorized level of funding for federal programs to conform to the budget limits set by Congress. The provisions of this bill include further cuts in the ESEA program, one that is critical to this district's voluntary integration program.

The appropriations measures currently being considered in both houses provide almost $1 billion more for fiscal year 1982 funding than the administration requested. Nevertheless, the ESEA Title I Concentration Grant, of particular importance for urban districts, was eliminated. Our Concentration Grant for 1980-81 was $3.8 million.

Looming even more ominously is the President's September 24 request for a new round of reductions, amounting to another $2 billion from elementary and secondary education. Assuming proportional reductions in the various programs involved, we anticipate an additional loss of $18 million (Column 3 of Exhibit A). These figures do not, of course, reflect the additional impact of inflation.

The block grant portion of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 would result in a partial solution for numerous problems faced by California's local school districts by eliminating many restrictive regulations and providing the flexibility necessary to meet those needs of students identified at the local level. On the other hand, our interpretation is that the effect of the block grant portion going to the local school districts will result in further reductions in the funding of those discrete programs that are currently providing services to our students.

Nevertheless, we applaud Congress for excluding ESEA Title I, Public Law 94-142 programs for the handicapped, bilingual education and vocational education from the block grant.

Until federal regulations have been promulgated, and the state mechanism for determining the allocation of block grant funds to school districts implemented, we cannot foretell the precise fiscal impact on our district.

Compounding this uncertainty, is the unstable fiscal climate in the nation. Combined, these factors do not augur well for public education in Los Angeles.

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and to share some of my thoughts. Public education continues to operate in an atmosphere of crisis. School districts are in deep financial trouble. They are expected to provide ever more individualized services to an ever increasing population of students with special needs. Each new requirement encroaches upon the general fund of the school district.

Our school district is composed of thousands of teachers and other staff who are dedicated, skilled, interested, and committed. I will not be so dramatic as to paraphrase Winston Churchill when he said "Give us the tools; we will finish the job," but I think the decisions that are made now regarding public education will have a critical effect upon the future of our society as we know it today.

May I conclude by again expressing appreciation to this committee for its continuing interest in the welfare of public education and its support of the local educational agencies' efforts to serve our children and youth.

EFFECTS OF RESCISSIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUESTS FOR REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL FUNDING—LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, OCT. 12, 1981

	School year		
	1980-81	1981-82 [1]	1982-83 [2]
Adult education basic grants	$1,454,704	$1,500,000	$1,320,000
Bilingual education	1,966,213	926,501	815,320
Civil Rights Act—Title IV:			
Sex equity	97,844	90,989	80,070
National origins	489,466		
CETA:			
PSE	10,731,315		
In-school youth employment	4,765,152	1,536,939	1,352,506
Adult skill training	4,870,909	1,880,125	1,654,510
Education for the handicapped, basic grants	7,241,400	6,320,700	5,562,216
ESEA, Title I:			
Basic grants	50,018,741	50,250,944	44,220,830

EFFECTS OF RESCISSIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUESTS FOR REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL FUNDING—LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, OCT. 12, 1981—Continued

	School year		
	1980-81	1981-82[1]	1982-83[2]
Neglected and delinquent	529,873	342,077	301,027
Concentration	3,800,000		
ESEA, Title IV-B	2,555,462	2,402,134	2,113,878
ESEA, Title IV-C	1,253,475	1,115,363	981,519
Emergency School Assistance Act	15,994,586	6,958,231	6,123,243
Follow Through	1,361,722		
Impact aid	2,520,336		
School lunch and child nutrition	78,897,195	70,839,720	62,338,953
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	4,191,761	3,190,202	2,807,377
Program improvement	500,038	440,150	387,332
Special programs for disadvantaged	196,684	132,791	116,856
Consumer and homemaking	497,967	355,205	312,580
Total	193,934,843	148,282,071	130,448,217

[1] Including rescissions.
[2] School year 1981-82 funding less a 12-percent reduction as requested by the administration.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Handler.

Next, Ms. Walters.

STATEMENT OF RITA WALTERS, MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ms. WALTERS. Thank you, Congressman Hawkins.

Before I begin my remarks, I would just like to say to Congressman Perkins a hearty welcome from the city of Los Angeles and that I personally have had over the years a great admiration for the work that you have performed in the Congress on behalf of all of the children of these United States.

I would like for you to know, from us in Los Angeles, just how very high in esteem we hold our Congressman, Augustus Hawkins. He truly is a beacon for us and we are pleased that you feel the same way we do.

I am pleased to welcome all of the members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education to Los Angeles, and I am also pleased to have the opportunity to present my views and concerns regarding the status and quality of public education, as well as my perceptions of the proper role of the Federal Government in education. It is in regard to the latter that I shall concentrate my remarks.

This hearing is being conducted in the heart of district 1, the area I represent on the Los Angeles Board of Education. It is one of seven school board electoral districts in our unified system. It contains 52 elementary schools, 11 junior high schools, 5 senior high schools, 3 continuation high schools, and 4 adult schools. There are about 95,000 pupils in electoral district 1—68,000 of those are kindergarten through 12th grade students.

In terms of students in schools, electoral district 1 of the Los Angeles Unified School District is comparable in size to many entire school districts elsewhere in the Nation. In its racial and ethnic composition, which is predominantly black and Hispanic, it is similar to many urban school districts throughout the country.

By way of contrast, the total Los Angeles Unified School District has 694 schools serving kindergarten through 12th grade students, and a K-to-12 student enrollment of 543,791, of which approximately 48 percent are Hispanic, 22 percent black, 22 percent Anglo. About 7 percent of our students are Asian-Pacific islanders, and less than 1 percent are Alaskan Natives or American Indians.

Of the 52 elementary schools in electoral district 1, 50 have been designated as title I—10 of the 11 junior high schools receive title I funds, and 3 of the 5 senior high schools are title I. That represents more than one-fourth of all of the title I elementary schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, more than half of the junior high schools in title I and nearly one-third of the senior high schools.

In the entire Los Angeles Unified School District, about 21 percent of the students are members of families who receive aid to families with dependent children, and in the area that I represent, that percentage is considerably higher.

In the Los Angeles Unified School District, 74 percent of the nearly 550,000 students participate in the free or reduced-price meals program, and that figure climbs to above 80 percent in the district that I represent. In this program alone, Mr. Chairman, the Los Angeles Unified School District has absorbed an $8 million reduction in Federal and State funding.

The foregoing data is offered to not only provide the subcommittee some insight into the needs of children in the immediate area, but to emphasize that these needs are pervasive in the total Los Angeles Unified School District.

The need for Federal assistance is a continuing one if we are to provide the disadvantaged children of this and other school districts an equal educational opportunity in order that they may lead full and productive lives. In California, as you know, proposition 13 has removed all taxing authority from local school districts, and we are now dependent on the State for the bulk of our support. The State surplus provided relief for districts and other agencies immediately following the passage of proposition 13.

Now that the State surplus has disappeared, we also find the toll in Federal reductions mounting: 40,000 library books, $8 million in the free and reduced-price meals program, 1,300 jobs for disadvantaged youth, numerous teaching positions, counselors, teacher assistants and education aides as a result of the reduction in ESEA funding, vocational education resource teachers, instructional supplies and equipment, and various nursing, counseling and audiovisual programs.

I fear the list may grow even longer.

Many children across this land have already begun to feel the damaging effect of these sweeping reductions in Federal assistance to education. People with compassion and concern for children are waiting disheartened and disillusioned to see where and when the next blow will fall.

My appeal, Mr. Chairman, is for congressional action to ward off the assaults on public education, and in particular the assaults on poor children by those whose political agenda includes no concern for either.

A recent editorial in the Nation, a news magazine, quoted the views of Secretary of Education Terrel Bell, whose chief task for the moment appears to be not only to dismantle the Department of Education but also to dismantle public education itself. The editorial indicated that in a recent TV appearance, Secretary Bell zeroed in on one of the chief sins of the past as he saw it, that of too much concern for the bottom level. That is the disadvantaged and slow learners. The Secretary was quoted as saying, "We have shifted our priorities down to the lower range of students. That is why teenagers aren't achieving."

The editorial offered this pitch as hard-ball new federalism, with the old reliable Laffer curve as a change-up. "Get the Government out of education, turn it back to the States via block grants, and cut taxes to free the investment funds that will create jobs, thus reinvigorating the local tax base and generating more money for the schools." The message the writer received from all this is an inference that I also draw, and that is that Secretary Bell was also enunciating a prescription for the abandonment of the egalitarian goals of public education in favor of a two-tier system catering to the middle and upper classes.

In this context, Mr. Chairman, the Nation pointed out the reduction in the free and reduced-price meal program takes on added significance. The school lunch program has for 35 years sought to provide a significant amount of the day's nutrition for poor children who do not get that nutrition at home. I don't believe any new evidence is needed to prove that hungry children simply do not learn as well as those who are fed.

The Nation went on to say: "Not only will poor children be underfed; they would be on short rations of learning by the curtailment of programs designed to make up for the lack of home influences that give middle-class children a head start. The cuts in title I, aid to inner-city schools, that the administration is seeking are part and parcel of this campaign. Add to this the drive against busing as a legal measure of last resort in desegregating schools, the effect of which will be to ratify permanently 'white flight' to the suburbs, and you have the growing pall of inequity over American schools."

The Nation concluded: "Free and equal public education available to all—that is the democratic ideal. Today it is in jeopardy."

Whether it is the Los Angeles Unified School District or any other school district in this Nation, each child deserves to receive an education of a quality equal to any other child in that school district. On that there can be no debate.

I must emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I am unalterably committed to the concept that segregated schools are as inherently unequal today as the Supreme Court found them to be in 1954. Attempts to eliminate one-race schools gives some promise that our constitutional guarantees of freedom, of justice, and of equal opportunity will be fulfilled. That promise must not be discarded.

Mr. Chairman, under no circumstance should the education of disadvantaged children be viewed as education of the bottom level, as Secretary Bell has termed it. Because a child is born black, or brown, and poor, does not mean that he or she cannot learn. In fact, there is mounting evidence schools are effective in teaching all children when there is a will to do so. Prof. Ron Edmonds of Harvard and other researchers examining pupil achievement data among students in schools serving low-income neighborhoods found that some of the schools brought the achievement level of "the children of the poor to those minimal masteries of the basic skills that now describe successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class."

Professor Edmonds states: "All children are eminently educable," and that "the behavior of the school is critical in determining the quality of that education." There was a certain similarity among those schools whose students were successful. Among them was the conviction shared by teachers, administrators, parents, and students themselves that they were indeed expected to succeed at learning.

Mr. Chairman, all of our children are worthy of the very best that we can give them, for it is they who will maintain the greatness of this Nation, a greatness which has been achieved in very large measure through a commitment made long ago to this great and noble idea of public education.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The paragraph in the written statement which was omitted in oral testimony follows:]

> For example, shortly after their arrival, the puritan fathers set about to found Harvard College, the Padres landed on the shores of California and began immediately to organize schools for children. Shortly after the city of Los Angeles was founded, the newly-elected mayor said, "First, in importance among the needs of the city is education." The recognition by blacks of education as a liberating force while still enslaved is historical.

Ms. **WALTERS**. Several years ago, A. W. Clausen, immediate past president of the Bank of America and currently president of the World Bank, said "Education is a game of chance and the prize is a higher quality of life for our children." Education is the great American gamble, but as far as our future is concerned, it is the only game in town.

Mr. Chairman and other members of the committee, for some to assign a low national priority to public education, thereby relegating some of our children to second-class citizenship, to regress in our support of the noble concept of free education for all, to waiver in our commitment to all children, is to weaken this Nation and jeopardize its future. I plead with you not to let this happen.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Thank you, Ms. Walters, for your usual good statement, well presented.

At this time the Chair would yield to Mr. Perkins.

Mr. **PERKINS**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First, I wish to compliment Ms. Walters and Dr. Handler for excellent testimony.

I am sure we are all aware of what has taken place in Washington this year. The Office of Management and Budget has stated that this is a local function; in other words, that the city of Los Angeles can pick up the slack and pay out extra money for all these cutbacks. But I am wondering, with your resources here, and so many minority groups of children in this city, how many are going to be left out and not get the proper assistance under title I in this inner-city area if we follow the philosophy of the Office of Management and Budget in Washington.

They are still planning on, or trying to get momentum to cut title I further in Washington, which I don't think our committee will go along with under any set of circumstances because it is just the wrong thing to do.

What is going to be the effect here in your city if you do not get increased funding for title I, taking into consideration the cutbacks that have already fallen in place? I will let each one of you answer that question. Go ahead first, Ms. Walters.

Ms. **Walters**. Thank you, Congressman.

I, too, am concerned that young people now being served by title I will no longer receive the same level of services, and that it is not to mention new students that may come into our district who also need title I services, bilingual services.

The Congress has never been able to fully appropriate the amount of funds that your committee would assign to meet the needs of the students in title I. We have done pretty well with what we have, but to cut it further means that we have no local money to pick up the slack.

The first 2 years that I was on the Los Angeles School Board, we cut a combined $100 million in local programs, locally funded programs, because of a lack of money from the State. Now with $45 million being cut already in Federal assistance, to cut even further, I am afraid, would spell disaster for those programs.

Mr. **Perkins**. Dr. Handler, you go ahead and answer.

Dr. **Handler**. Thank you, Congressman Perkins.

I have asked a member of our staff, Assistant Superintendent Pauline Hopper, to give me the number of schools that are presently being served and another number which we will have in a minute of the schools where there are children who are eligible who aren't being served right now. There is the assumption that we have been able to serve all of the youngsters who are eligible, and we have not, and then making an assumption of a 25-percent cut, I will be able to give you an example. We will submit a number.

But one of two things can occur. It either means fewer schools or schools that are presently in the program no longer participating, or it means a dilution of those services that are presently being offered, and eventually, when you begin to dilute, you reach a point of close to zero effectiveness.

Mr. **Perkins**. Let me ask you another question, Dr. Handler.

You suggested that the Federal Government has a role in encouraging vocational education. How should the Federal Government do that, and do you believe we should encourage programs in regular high areas or in area vocational schools?

Before you answer that question, I want to add one more question in order to conserve time.

You know how we cut back the school lunch program, and I want to ask you, in this section out here in Los Angeles, in the inner-city areas, whether you have witnessed any dropouts of children participating in the school lunch program and what effects have occurred from the cut in the milk program, where the program was limited to schools without regular lunch programs?

Dr. **Handler**. The last of the two questions first, if I may.

Mr. **Perkins**. You go ahead any way you want to.

Dr. **Handler**. It is too early to be able to indicate the extent to which the cuts in food services this year will or will not contribute to an increase in dropouts.

The second question, insofar as the milk program is concerned—I am sorry, but could you please repeat the second part of that second question?

Mr. **Perkins**. That was in connection with where you do not have the lunch program, where the program was limited to schools without a regular lunch program, I asked you what effect the cutback in the milk program would have.

Dr. **Handler**. We have to increase our prices. And with an increase in prices, what we do is we get about a 20-percent dropout of participation in the program period.

Mr. **Perkins**. Have you already noticed a dropout because of the increase in prices resulting from the cutback in Washington?

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Perkins**. To what extent have you noticed the dropout of this regular school lunch program here in this city, or in the free and reduced-price program here in this city?

Dr. **Handler**. May I ask the food services expert?

Mr. **Perkins**. Yes. Go ahead and ask him.

Dr. **Handler**. He has all of the data. We anticipate——

Mr. **Perkins**. And then I will ask Ms. Walters, too, to answer the same questions. Go right ahead.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Would you identify the witness, please, Dr. Handler?

Dr. **Handler**. Mr. Al Woods, the head of our food services department.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF AL WOODS, FOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENT, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. **Woods**. Good morning, gentlemen of the committee.

We have some early figures in regard to the question that you asked, and they are very severe in the impact because of the price increases that we had to inflict, if you will, on the youngsters in order to pick up for the cuts that were occasioned by the Government's action.

In the full-price lunches, we raised the elementary level from 50 cents to 75 cents, and that was the first large increase that we had in 9 years. That has occasioned a 37-percent dropout in the kids that participated in that program.

In the free program, we have already had a 6-percent dropout, and this was supposed to be a group of people that wouldn't be impacted by the cuts.

So you can see it is quite severe. We are talking in terms of maybe 15,000 children.

Mr. **Miller**. If I could interrupt you, do you know if the children in the free category moved, if they are now participating in the reduced-price or they are simply not participating?

Mr. WOODS. There has been an increase in the participation in the reduced-price, but some of the youngsters there—there is a transfer—that were formerly qualified for the reduced-price program are no longer qualified because of the change in the criteria for eligibility.

So all along the line the impact has been quite severe, given the early figures. What we are concerned about is some of the things we are hearing down the line relative to the deferral program, which may be another 12-percent cut this year.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, the whole school lunch program in one sense of the word is in jeopardy because of the increased price you have had to add on, and that affects the truly needy that the President spoke about that would not be hurt, the free and reduced-price children.

Mr. WOODS. Across the board it affects everybody, and I am not sure what truly needy means any more.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I am not either. That is the President's language.

Mr. WOODS. We don't look on this program, incidentally, as a social or welfare program. It is a child nutrition program, and when you impact all of the children, it diminishes their capacity to assimilate what is a very good educational program.

Mr. PERKINS. We don't ever want to see it turned into a welfare program.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Let the lady, Ms. Walters, comment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Woods, will you remain at the table, just in case there is a question?

Ms. Walters?

Ms. WALTERS. I would just like to say that I share the concerns expressed by both Mr. Woods and Dr. Handler. It really seems to me that when we start attacking the nutrition of our children at the expense of providing additional funds for the Department of Defense, we have put our priorities in truly the wrong place.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Walters, I want to commend you for your statement, and it ties in. It is interesting that you have chosen to single out the Secretary of Education here, because he appeared before our committee earlier this year, and when asked about the title I program and a couple of nutrition programs he told this committee that no one could argue that these programs had not been successful and that they had not worked, but they were simply going to go ahead and cut them because that is where the money was; that is where the big chunks of money that they had to contribute to the President's effort were, in spite of the fact that they were successful and they were, in fact, working.

I say that in light of your statement that I think is almost key in this budget fight, and that is (1) that there is no evidence needed on the nutritional plight of poor children in this country, especially in urban settings. And by the same token, you say there is mounting evidence, and I suspect also that there is no new evidence needed, that poor children can learn and, in fact, do learn, and when given the proper resources learn to the same extent to which middle-class or wealthy children learn and can accomplish the same tasks.

Yet, as you point out with The Nation article, we find an administration moving to suggest that, in fact, our schools will be resegregated, perhaps not along racial lines, but clearly along economic lines. I think that people ought to be aware of that and I am happy that you raised those points. I am sad that they have to be raised, but I think you articulated them in an outstanding fashion; that despite this continued cynicism or cocktail-party talk about how these programs don't work, in fact, the programs do work. We know that the nutritional programs, between what Chairman Perkins has done in school lunch, and what has been done in food stamps have basically been the sole reason for the eradication of the devastating hunger that was found in this country as late as 1970.

We know that under title I, those children are learning better, they are learning faster, and they are retaining it longer than the children who didn't participate, as are the children in Head Start.

The sad thing is that an administration can get off with the rhetoric rather than the evidence, because the evidence is absolutely contrary, as I think you have pointed out, and as I think Superintendent Handler has pointed out. In this district where you have had the resources, you have been able to deal with the problems. You have been able to achieve successes.

That long statement leads to a question. I guess the cuts, and whether the 12 percent is successful or not, I think it is pretty clear that at least another attempt is going to be made at another round of cuts, either this 12 percent or in this first budget resolution next year. If the cuts are a fact of life, and the Congress goes along, even though there will be greater reluctance this time but I suspect they very well may go along in any case, how would you rearrange what money comes to you to allow you to survive the best you can?

Superintendent Handler, you mentioned—which I am not quite clear about—that you have a mandatory ticketing which you believe costs you around $2 million, and I guess we are all in the business now of seeing how we can make that dollar go as far as we can. I would just like some of your thoughts on what we can do. It gets caught up in the rhetoric of reduced paperwork, but I haven't seen that that has really saved anybody money, and I am looking for more than just that rhetorical answer.

Dr. **Handler**. The administration of the National School Lunch Program, and in that I include the breakfast program, is very costly because of the requirement for masking the identity, the anonymity, if you will, of the free lunch and reduced-price lunch recipient. That, in and of itself, is a good thing.

But coupled with that, coming down the line now, there are increasing requirements relative to validation of the applications, asking food service people or school district people to determine whether or not there has been any fraud perpetrated, and we don't have the capacity to do that, and any of that cost must, perforce, come out of the money available to present a lunch or a breakfast.

These are increasing requirements, and as other costs go up, they go up in turn, too. We are spending roughly about $2 million in Los Angeles now.

Mr. **Miller**. Let me ask you if it is your testimony, are you telling us that you are spending more to determine whether or not you have these problems than the problems cost the program? I mean, do you have such a great number of people who are into the program in violation of the guidelines that you are ferreting them out and you are saving this $2 million, or are you spending $2 million to ferret out a couple hundred thousand dollars worth of people who are in one program or the other where maybe they shouldn't be?

Dr. **Handler**. We don't have any firm figures on how many people may or may not be telling the truth on an application presently. However, it is my decided opinion, based on about 12 years of involvement in this program, that the amount of money expended to catch the relatively few, if you will, that may be perpetrating a fraud would be unconscionable because of the cost; in other words, we would be spending more to catch up with that individual by many times over what we are expending to give that lunch out to that person, albeit illegitimately.

Mr. **Miller**. Ms. Walters, you testified as to the statistics within your district, as to virtually every school——

Mr. **Perkins**. Will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. **Miller**. Surely.

Mr. **Perkins**. I remember when we were in conference and we tried to get Senator Helms to knock these provisions out, and Mr. Miller was right there insisting, and we just could not do anything at that time to get him to do that. That is what is costing you extra money today.

According to the figures that I have before me, you people up until this year, before they set in on us in Washington, were receiving more money, reimbursement money, in the child nutrition programs, $63.4 million in this city, compared with only $50.6 million for title I. That is the way they hammered on us up there in that darn conference, that reconciliation process, but we fought our hearts out, Mr. Miller, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Kildee. We are all on it.

But if we had not been there, they would have taken this school lunch program for a rough ride. They would have just about destroyed it, for all intents and purposes, but we are trying to hold and cling and do everything we can to gain everything back that we have lost.

Excuse me, Mr. Miller, for interrupting you to that extent.

Mr. **Miller**. I appreciate that, because that is a re-run of what we experienced when I worked in the legislature with Ronald Reagan. He always spent more money to catch the thieves than the thieves took.

Virtually every school at all levels in your district is a title I school, according to your testimony. I just wondered, as you talk to the administrators and to the school-site people, how do they envision that they are going to cope with these cuts that the district is going to sustain? They have the population that we are supposed to be, or at least up until now, are trying to get ahead with.

Ms. **Walters**. I think their concerns and attitudes and plans, if you will, are probably best embodied in an anecdote that Congressman Perkins related to a group of public educators last spring in Washington when he said what the administration was asking school districts to do was akin to a family whose father had been parceling out the money all along and suddenly turns to the wife and said, "You take charge of the pursestrings, but I am going to give you 25 percent less money. We still have the same number of children and may have more in the future, but you are going to have 25 percent less money to deal with."

It really is, looking as a family would look, to meals of lesser cost, and in terms of educational offerings to youngsters, where do you start cutting? Far away from the classroom. Well, counselors are not in the classroom. Maybe you take out counselors. Maybe you take out nurses. The young people who are served by title I funds are the very youngsters who need most those kinds of support services that title I has been able to offer.

So it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. If Secretary Bell feels that——

Mr. **Hawkins**. Ms. Walters, may I interrupt? We are having a few difficulties hearing. Would those speaking try to use the instruments in front of them so that those in the rear of the room can be heard?

Ms. **Walters**. Yes, Congressman. Sorry. Is that better?

Mr. **Hawkins**. Yes. We certainly don't want to lose what you are saying. It is very well said.

Ms. **Walters**. Thank you.

It just seems to me that to pull out this money, to question the need, to somehow feel that funding poor children, funding school programs where poor children attend is looked upon as some massive welfare handout, is really to miss the issue that is involved here. I have never been able to understand how massive Federal guaranteed loans for Lockheed that, as far as I am concerned, is guilty of overruns, cost overruns, that are astronomical in terms of Federal contracts, and yet the Government underwrites those loans and does not call it welfare.

Yet we have hungry children, children who absolutely will go without food if these programs are totally withdrawn, and others, because of the regulations that may push them into higher categories, will also go without food, and the Federal Government under this administration does not perceive it has a role in supplying or meeting that need. I have difficulty understanding it.

Mr. **Miller**. This is my last point, Mr. Chairman.

But you don't see the school-site personnel having the ability—and when I say the ability, I mean the wherewithal to do it; not their willingness to do it—to rearrange so dramatically the educational programs that that school could provide the same level of program as they were providing before, under these cuts?

Ms. **Walters**. Absolutely not.

Mr. **Miller**. That is the theory, if you remember.

Ms. **Walters**. That is the theory, and I think it is a bucketful of holes. Again I remind you, and I know I do not need to remind you of what proposition 13 has done to governmental institutions across California, and particularly to school districts. We are the only governmental entity who was ever forbidden from raising and levying a tax. So there is no local tax base to raise for schools.

We are at the mercy of the State. The State is running out of money. The Governor has called back the State legislature to deal with the problems of welfare funding. Just this morning statistics were released that indicated California is leading the Nation in unemployment.

How does a family that is unemployed, a family that was living on the edge of disaster to begin with, feed their children and send them to a school that is reducing the educational food, and how does that child come out at the end of that cycle prepared to be a contributing citizen?

Mr. MILLER. I don't have the answer to your question.

Ms. WALTERS. It is my frustration in dealing with the problems of not only my district, but the problems of the total Los Angeles District, and I know it is your frustration as you dedicate yourself to dealing with the educational problems of poor children across the Nation.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly want to thank you, Ms. Walters, because I think that you have helped in a very dramatic and articulate fashion to pierce that rhetorical veil around the claims of this administration that they could cut you by 20 to 25 percent and life would go on as it had before. You are demonstrating to this committee that, in fact, that is not the case and that certainly the Congress ought to heed what the evidence is that has come pouring in.

We have heard similar evidence to what you said, Mr. Woods, all across the country about the closing down of programs when, in fact, no program was supposed to be hurt, no poor children were supposed to be injured. They have been left without any program in many school districts. Not partial participation; no participation. I think we are finding in title I schools, I know in my district where I have a substantial number of title I schools, the story is the same. The level of educational opportunity is dramatically being compromised against what children were being offered before.

Ms. WALTERS. It absolutely is, Mr. Congressman. And if I may be so bold to say, the cost of one of these AWACS planes, or some of these MX missiles that they are going to stash around the country would go a long way to educating the children that are in our schools today, and to the identification of those children who may be the scientists of tomorrow and to those children who must have the opportunity to fill the seats in which we sit today.

Mr. MILLER. There are a lot of studies, you know, that they won't have the engineers or scientists to fire the missiles in the future if we don't take care of this population. It may be a blessing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I went on so long.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I understand that the math scores have gone up this year in Los Angeles and that reading scores for younger students have gone up, and have stabilized for the older students. Is that correct?

Dr. HANDLER. That is correct. Our third-grade reading scores have gone up slightly. Our fifth- and eighth- grade scores have stayed about the same. Our math scores at 3, 5, and 8 have gone up. I am pleased that they have gone up, but we still have a long way to go to hit the national average.

Mr. KILDEE. Do you think title I has helped you in achieving that?

Dr. HANDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILDEE. The largest school district in my congressional district in Michigan is Flint Community Schools. They receive about $9 million in Federal assistance. More than a third of that, close to $4 million, is title I. What percentage of your Federal assistance is for title I, roughly?

Dr. HANDLER. As a percent of our total Federal assistance?

Mr. KILDEE. Yes.

Dr. HANDLER. About a third.

Mr. KILDEE. That is what I have been hearing from representatives of school districts throughout the country. So to the degree that the Reagan administration wants to cut title I, you are getting cut pretty severely in Federal assistance?

Dr. HANDLER. Yes, sir. I have those numbers of schools. We presently have 231 schools in the title I program. We have 60 schools that are eligible that aren't being served because the dollars wouldn't go far enough; that is, the current dollars. In the event the most severe case of these cuts should occur, we would drop to about 173 schools out of the need for 291 schools, and that is rather severe.

Mr. KILDEE. Are your plans, then, to serve fewer students and try to keep the quality of the program, to serve the same number of students with a reduced-quality program, or to combine these ills somehow?

Dr. HANDLER. If I may, it is difficult for me to respond to the question because I don't know the nature of the regulations that will come forth relative to the dollars. However, having been involved in the questions related to title I funding and programs since their inception, it is a shame to throw away what we have learned.

One of the things we learned in the process, after about the fourth or fifth year, is the importance of what was referred to in those days as the critical mass, a concentration of services as opposed to dilution. My feeling is that either approach, whether you begin to reduce up to the point where you are no longer effective, or you begin to eliminate schools, could negatively affect at least 100,000 students in this district.

Mr. KILDEE. The administration is able to sell a lot of these cuts to programs under a flag of fiscal integrity, but really, under that flag of fiscal integrity there is a strong philosophical flag. What is beginning to bother me more and more in light of various enunciations from the administration is that I am also beginning to detect a certain antipublic school bias.

Would you care to comment on that?

Dr. HANDLER. Yes, sir. I included that in my statement. If you will note, I reference that as one of our major concerns. I don't hold the credentials of an economist. However, from what I understand, with Federal cuts, and with the reduction in taxes, with more money available, the private sector now is in a better position to create jobs to stimulate the economy, and all of these good things have the potential of occurring.

Now, theoretically that may be appealing. What I haven't heard is, where is the safety net for public education if the assumptions inherent in this economic theory do not hold to be true?

Mr. **Kildee**. It could be disastrous, couldn't it?

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Kildee**. I think education is so vulnerable to problems in the economy. Michigan right now is suffering enormous unemployment. My own district, for example, has 16-percent unemployment. The governmental unit that is most vulnerable to a downturn in the economy is education. You just see it. The city of Flint has a very good school system It is a shame to see them make cuts to programs. They are trying to make these cuts without hurting the students, but you can see that the quality of programs is starting to be affected.

I think that not only are education cuts actually hurting public schools, but there are some in the administration who don't share your enthusiasm for public schools, period. I really feel that. It worries me that there appears to be an intent to withhold public support of public schools. I think that is something we have to watch very, very carefully.

Dr. **Handler**. We definitely do. And also the effect that it has on the morale of the people who are in those schools who are dedicated to doing a good job, who are working daily with young people in an effort to bring about improvement, and when it would appear that there is no support, even at the Federal level, or limited support for public education, then we begin to raise these rhetorical questions relative to why is it more people aren't interested in coming into teaching. That, too, becomes circular and can have a very damaging effect.

Mr. **Kildee**. I really appreciate your testimony this morning. I am glad I came to Los Angeles, because I think we supporters of education in Congress have to keep fortifying ourselves. As we go back to Washington and fight for the continuation of Federal education programs, it is good to have seen again firsthand what we are working for.

The Office of Management and Budget tends to know the price of everything but the value of nothing. They have no concept at all, for example, of the value of title I. Mr. Reagan doesn't clearly understand what title I's purpose is. Mr. Stockman has no concept of the value of title I. The difference between price and value is one of the big problems we have in Washington right now. While OMB is pricing programs out, they really aren't evaluating them very well.

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir. I have never testified before a congressional committee before, so this is a new experience for me, and may I humbly submit that if you need any help, I know of no champion in public education more articulate, more effective, than Ms. Walters, and I am certain she would be happy to help you.

Mr. **Kildee**. I really appreciated her testimony. It has been excellent.

I have no further questions. I thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Dr. Handler, you indicated that title I had been highly effective in response to one question, and yet I think you also indicated not a substantially great academic improvement. Can you reconcile what seems to be a conflict between the effectiveness of a program and perhaps some disappointment in the academic performance of students?

Dr. **Handler**. I can share with you how I reconcile it in terms of some hypotheses I have, and when there is more time I would be happy to share whatever data we have in relationship to the question.

When one takes a look at our test scores over the past 5 years, 5 years ago they were better than they are now. Then they went down and they came back up. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2. Test scores are important, there is no question in my mind, and test scores are the way the public have of—it is like a report card for the school. But there are other educational outcomes that occur by going to school that aren't measured by tests that also should be given recognition, and some of these, I believe, are still very operative and some descriptive data can be shared with the committee related to that.

But there are three other things, two of which relate to your particular question, Congressman.

I think that the people in the educational community, well intended, went through a phase of exploring a number of alternatives in order to improve performance. In this continuous changing of emphasis or continuing changing of programs as they were attempting to identify what Ron Edmonds has considered, and I agree, to be the most important aspects, that in some cases did have a negative effect related to reading scores or math scores.

So I think where we are now is that two things must hold true. I think we are now able to identify the standards that are important for the student, the teacher, the administrator, and the parent in relationship to improved learning. I think we are also saying that we have reached a point where, with stability of funding, with forward funding, with being able to plan ahead, that our gains should now become consistent, and it is most unfortunate that once again we are placed in a situation of uncertainty, in a way indicating that some failure was built into the program by the way the program has been handled by the uncertain funding of the program, the changes in the policies and philosophy of the program. You have been burdened with those as well as the moneys that you have received.

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir. I think these were well intentioned, but I think after you try something for 2 years and you change to something else and you change to something else, that eventually that has a negative effect.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Ms. Walters, also along the same line, Dr. Edmonds and others testified just a week ago in Washington that while they supported title I, they felt that there could be some improvements in the way that title I is being programed or is being handled administratively.

Among those changes that Dr. Edmonds, in particular, suggested was that instead of income being the test of the basis of the criteria used that performance might be considered, which I assume would get us into the question of better testing of students.

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the need for such changes?

Ms. **Walters**. Well, Congressman Hawkins, I think that there have been problems along the way with title I funding and the criteria. But I think the essence of title I, what the essence of title I has meant to children across the Nation, is that it represented a national commitment to see that no child throughout the United States, by virtue of the condition of his or her birth, went without an equal educational opportunity, and I think it is there that from that point all others flow, and that there can be adjustments to make the funding more effective, to reward achievement, and all of those good things.

But I think first and foremost, the national commitment must remain.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Are you saying that this administration seems to be turning its back on such a commitment?

Ms. **Walters**. Absolutely, Congressman Hawkins. I was horrified last year in Washington at a meeting of the Council of Great City Schools to hear a gentleman from the White House, whose name was Bakshian, Aram Bakshian, tell that group of superintendents and board members from the 28 largest cities in these United States that this administration was elected by people who no longer believed or supported public education and that they had an obligation to those people and so, because of that, they were supporting the imposition of tuition tax credits.

That was as clear a statement as I have heard from this administration that they give public education short shrift.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Just for the sake of the record, may I ask you whether you are supporting or opposed to tuition tax credits?

Ms. **Walters**. I am opposed to tuition tax credits.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you. May the Chair, on behalf of the committee, commend the witnesses for a very fine presentation. I think you have been marvelously helpful to the committee, and certainly we are going to continue to call on your expertise.

Dr. Handler, you indicated that you had some data that would support the contention that there have been some improvements as a result of title I. Along that line, if you do have such data, if you will submit it to the committee we will keep the record open, because I think this is an important issue involved in it because the administration has sustained or has rationalized its budget cuts on the basis that we are throwing money at the problem, that these programs have not succeeded, and therefore that we should try something new.

I think Ms. Walters has well indicated that what we are trying now is not something new, but what we have developed away from. So we would certainly appreciate any additional information that you can furnish to the committee.

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir.

[The information referred to above follows:]

Los Angeles City Board of Education,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 3, 1982.

Hon. Carl Perkins,
House Education and Labor Committee,
Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: One of the issues in which you expressed interest when I testified before your Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on November 6, 1981 was the effect of ESEA Title I programs upon student achievement. I regret the delay in providing this information, and hope it will still be useful to you. Some of the ancillary effects of the program will, I believe, be of particular interest.

A longitudinal study has been conducted in the 55 schools which have had ESEA Title I programs since 1969-70. Data for the original 55 schools show that from 1969-70 to 1980-81, the sixth grade reading achievement rose from the 12th national norm median percentile to the 27th percentile. The 6th grade median national norm percentile for mathematics rose in these schools from the 15th percentile in 1969-70 to the 37th percentile in 1980-81.

Looking at the data another way shows that in the initial year, 54 of the 55 schools were below the 20th percentile in reading achievement. By 1980-81, only 13 remained in that category. In mathematics achievement, 42 of the 55 schools were below the 20th national norm percentile in 1969-70. By 1980-81, none were in that category.

The parent and community involvement intrinsic to Title I programs has motivated many of the participants to seek further education, both to help their own children and to seek careers which utilize their interest in and experience with the educational program. Of the community persons who have been members of the district-level Title I advisory committees two have become board members (one in our district and one in an adjacent district), one is an aide to a member of the Los Angeles City Council, one coordinates the western region law and poverty program, one works for the county employment service department, one coordinates a pre-school, two who started as parent volunteers became aides and then social workers, two became high school teachers, more than ninety became elementary teachers, two of the teachers, became teacher advisors, and some forty-five acquired associate in arts degrees.

More than 250 of the youngsters in the neglected and delinquent children program, through counseling, have obtained and retained jobs for at least 5 years. It is estimated that more than 100 of the junior high and high school students who, at the request of the feeder elementary schools, tutored younger children in Title I cross-age tutoring efforts are now in college.

In terms of direct employment of community persons in Title I programs, the district currently employs 5,950 part-time education aides and 2,710 postsecondary students, who are able to stay in school because of their part-time employment as teacher assistants.

Such effects of the ESEA Title I program will carry over into future generations. Test scores cannot adequately describe all of these factors which will have lasting significance for both students and our society.

Sincerely yours,

Harry Handler,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. Miller. Also, Mr. Woods, that would very helpful also. We have an ongoing information gathering that we are trying to go through on the school lunch program because Mr. Perkins has had the administrators of the program before the committee and at least they said that they would consider the evidence that would suggest that maybe the dropout rate is much greater than anticipated in light of calls for new cuts in the program.

So anything that you can supply us, when you have it, will be terribly helpful to that discussion.

Mr. Woods. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. Hawkins. Just one minute. Ms. Vance is representing the minority members of the committee to us in Washington. That means the Republican members. I would like to recognize her presence as part of the staff, along with Mr. Jack Jennings, who is the majority staff member.

Ms. Vance, do you have any questions?

Ms. **Vance**. I do not have any questions now. I would like to express interest on behalf of the minority members that were unable to make it today—Congressman Ashbrook, our ranking minority member, and Congressman Goodling, who is the ranking minority for the Subcommittee on Elementary Secondary and Vocational Education. They are interested in knowing your concerns, and I am here today to listen to those and to gather any information that you have to give. It is a pleasure to be here. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Just one minute, Dr. Handler. We were trying to clarify one statement. Go ahead, Mr. Miller.

Mr. **Miller**. On the chart that you provided us on your budget, under the CETA program apparently last year you received $10,731,000, and for the next school year you don't anticipate receiving any of that money.

Those personnel slots are gone, and I assume that they have not been replaced, whether they were helpful in the classroom or elsewhere?

Dr. **Handler**. They have not, and the people have been dismissed.

Mr. **Miller**. How many people?

Dr. **Handler**. At this point, we terminated 1,048 public service employees.

Mr. **Miller**. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. May I ask you again, in connection with that, Dr. Handler, it was not directly an education issue so I did not bring it up, but were those CETA enrollees involved in meaningful work? The issue has been raised in terms of CETA employees being worthless, lazy, not doing a constructive job, the usual leaf-raking type. Are we to assume that these individuals that you lost were actively engaged in constructive work, were performing up to standard in the educational system?

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir. They were actively engaged in constructive work and, in addition, the CETA program provided an excellent avenue for them to develop additional skills and eventually become full-time employees of the district as a result of the CETA experience.

Mr. **Hawkins**. What will you do with their loss? Will you be able to fill any of those positions that provided those needed services?

Dr. **Handler**. No, sir, because, as Ms. Walters has indicated, 2 years in a row we have had to make severe reductions in our own general fund, and we are not in a position to hire additional people.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Would it be true to say that you are not only affected by the cutbacks in education but the cutbacks in the CETA program have also impacted on you?

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you.

Mr. **Perkins**. One question I would like to ask Ms. Walters and Dr. Handler both.

I have been greatly impressed with the migration of the Spanish people into this area.

To what extent is the Spanish migration increasing annually and what has been the increase here in the last 10 years? I would just like to get that for my own information, and I would also like to know what impact this has on title I and your nutrition programs. Go ahead and discuss that with me just a minute.

Ms. **Walters**. Congressman Perkins, the Hispanic enrollment in our schools and the in-migration in our State has increased almost geometrically over the years. The Los Angeles Times did an article not too long ago indicating that California may well be the first Third World State. And certainly as we look at the Hispanics in our school district, about 48 percent of the school population this year is Hispanic, and that indicates, as you well state, a need for additional services, a need for nutritional services, a need for bilingual services, to bring these students up to full fluency in English.

As you were speaking before the hearing started, you referenced the Hispanic persons with whom you spoke, spoke Spanish, but they also spoke English, and that is one of our goals and one of our charges, that we must bring the students to some fluency in English.

I frankly hope that our students who were born here gain a fluency in Spanish at the same time. That is one of the great shortcomings that I see of our public schools, that we do not have, as part of our programs, a language program that graduates students who are not only fluent in English but in another language of their choice.

Mr. **Perkins**. The influx of Spanish people, though, has been at—what would you say—5 percent a year or something like that, on the increase into the Los Angeles area?

Ms. **Walters**. I think it is greater than that; much greater.

Dr. **Handler**. Although I do not have the exact number, we can get it for you. That was reported on the census data. Some other numbers that are very important, as Ms. Walters has indicated: 48 percent of our students are Hispanic. However, you take a look at our kindergarten enrollment, and it is going to approximate about 60-percent Hispanic. So by following that through, in a very short period of time the district will be well over 60-percent Hispanic students.

Ms. **Walters**. I might add, Mr. Chairperson, that in some quarters this influx of Hispanics in our society is looked upon as a burden. I don't think it should be viewed in that regard. I think that we should view these new Americans as contributors to the warp and woof of our society and be pleased for the diversity that they bring us and learn from and build on the things that they can contribute as building blocks in our total society.

If I may add, in terms of title I, Congressman Miller and Congressman Hawkins asked about the CETA program and what the benefits to those people had been. Dr. Handler said some of them had gone on to become regular employees, but we have not been able to absorb very many.

One of the added benefits of title I that we don't hear talked about is the fact that because of the mandated parent involvement component, a lot of parents went back to school and have become teachers in our district. I think that is an added benefit that was serendipitous and certainly is not to be lost.

Mr. **Hawkins**. On the issue of Spanish-speaking people, I think that the record should at least show that this should not come as a shock to anyone that Spanish-speaking people are the dominant group that founded the city of Los Angeles many years ago, and I think it is rather fortunate that we are gifted to be able to speak English today and not all of us be speaking Spanish.

So I think we should recognize that this influx may be recent, but to view it as a problem, certainly as Ms. Walters indicated, is far from true historically and that historically a great deal is owed to those who speak the Spanish language.

Mr. **Kildee**. Just a brief question. You said that about 48 percent of your school population is Hispanic; is that correct?

Ms. **Walters**. Yes.

Mr. **Kildee**. What percentage of your school population is enrolled in a bilingual program?

Dr. **Handler**. Between 20 and 25 percent.

Mr. **Kildee**. Is your bilingual program philosophically a maintenance program or a transitional program? I believe you are familiar with the terminology.

Dr. **Handler**. Yes, sir. The major thrust of what we refer to as our LAU program is transition and where we can afford it we try to provide a maintenance program as well, but the major thrust is transition.

Mr. **Kildee**. I think sometimes we have looked upon bilingualism as something to be cured. I have always looked upon bilingualism as a blessing. I wish I were bilingual. I think we are the most monolingual country in the world.

Dr. **Handler**. If I may, there are students—not individual students—but throughout our district you may find 82 different languages spoken in our greater Los Angeles Unified School District.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Hawkins**. The committee has no objection to your becoming bilingual, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. **Kildee**. I speak Latin, but there isn't much demand for that.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you very much, again, to the witnesses.

Ms. **Walters**. Thank you for inviting us.

[Information supplied by Dr. Handler follows:]

Los Angeles City Board of Education,
Superintendent of Schools,
Los Angles, Calif., January 26, 1982.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: Again, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to describe to the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on November 6, 1981, the effects that federal legislative program cuts are having and will have on the future of educational programs provided by the Los Angeles Unified School District.

At that time, I indicated to the Committee that I would provide additional information regarding the effect that reductions in the school nutritional program appropriations are having on the recipients of this particular program. Accordingly, our staff has compared the number of free, reduced-price, and full-price lunches and breakfasts served during the week ending October 9, 1981 with the 1980–81 average. They found that at the elementary level, participation in free, reduced-price, and full-price lunches dropped by 5, 15, and 38 percent, respectively, while breakfasts showed decreases of 6, 39, and 60 percent, respectively. At the junior high school level, participation in free lunches and breakfasts rose by 4 and 2 percent, respectively; there were 29 percent more reduced-price lunches, but 29 percent fewer reduced-price breakfasts, and a reduction of 66 percent in full-price lunches and 82 percent in full-price breakfasts. Senior high schools also showed increases in free and reduced-price lunches and free breakfasts, ranging between 5 and 10 percent, but a 3-percent decrease in reduced-price breakfasts, a 55-percent decrease in full-price lunches, and an 80-percent decrease in full-price breakfasts.

The Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education and members of the staff are most appreciative of your efforts which are directed toward the maintenance of the vital school nutrition program. Please be assured that the Los Angeles congressional delegation is being kept apprised of the effect that past and future proposed fiscal reductions have on the district's ability to provide an educational program and services so essential to students in a large urban setting such as Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

HARRY HANDLER.

Mr. HAWKINS. The next witness is Mr. William Zimmerman, treasurer of the United Teachers-Los Angeles.

Mr. Zimmerman, we welcome you as a witness to the committee. The United Teachers of Los Angeles certainly should be commended as an organization for the excellent contribution that they have made in this field, and we look forward to your testimony, which in its entirety will be entered into the record. You may proceed, then, to give us the highlights or to summarize from it as you so desire.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, TREASURER, UNITED TEACHERS-LOS ANGELES

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address the subcommittee on an issue of universal concern, the status of education today. We are glad that this hearing is being held and that Los Angeles was high on the list.

The United Teachers-Los Angeles, which represents the 31,000 teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District, is committed to public education and is at the subcommittee's disposal to help find answers to the dilemma public education is in today.

The point I have to make is, public education is in trouble. Schools are not safe. They are falling apart. Many are overcrowded. They are underequipped and understaffed. We need help in the form of additional support to maintain, at the very least, a reasonable level of education in the schools, but what we are left with are mandates without money, massive Federal and State cutbacks in funding, and the promise that it is more of the same in the future.

We seem to have reached a crossroad. The Federal Government made a commitment to the American people that every child had a right to free and equal education. Yet today, the money to pay for that promise seems to be going elsewhere, leaving the educators and the parents and the children with a system, an expectation and a need, but not the resources to deliver.

Public education has come a long way since the days of the one-room schoolhouse. Throughout this century, public education has won broad acceptance as a top national priority. With the baby boom of the 1950's, many programs were developed, school lunches, guidance counseling, parent involvement, vocational education, teacher aides. We began to see nurses, music teachers, art teachers, and reading teachers.

As demands for still more programs to meet the complex social imbalances were placed on the educational institution, again, flexibility and innovation prevailed.

But today, the educators and other public servants around the country and here in Los Angeles are getting a clear message from the Reagan administration, the Congress, the tax limitation proponents, as well as from more of the parents of the children we teach. The budget crunch must be solved by basically sacrificing basic human needs. With deep Federal cutbacks for public services and social programs, it is going to be very difficult for the financially strapped urban areas of America and their school districts to maintain the level of delivery that has been sustained for decades.

Los Angeles teachers know that the commitment to education is plummeting. The public believes we are not doing enough. Rather than increased resources to improve educational programs, meet higher demand, and the enormous responsibilities placed on today's teacher, we are asked to do more with less.

The central issue we hear debated in Washington, D.C., these days is money, not improved education, and how to cut funds, not how to save our cherished gift to young Americans.

Indeed, teachers perceive quite a different role for the Federal Government. Federal involvement was always looked at as a way of completing the learning process at the local level. Federally initiated programs helped to create a whole learning environment by addressing the problems of the poor, the handicapped, and special groupings who needed the highest level of guarantee for justice.

The Education and Consolidation Improvement Act of 1981 provides for the consolidation of 28 categorical programs in elementary and secondary education. How can the Federal Government guarantee that specific problems will be targeted with the virtual elimination of categorical grants? Why did we create categorical programs in the first place if we thought block grants were more appropriate?

Instead, we are faced with a possible total of 29 percent in Federal cuts to education nationwide. In Los Angeles, we will see the elimination of CETA, Follow Through, and impact aid. We will also experience cuts in adult education below the 1980 level. Deep cuts in bilingual education which particularly hurts Los Angeles, cuts in education for the handicapped, ESEA programs, school lunch, vocational education, and much more.

Proposition 13 has taken its own precious chunk out of the tax revenues that would have appropriated moneys to education in Los Angeles, and if a tuition-tax credit were passed on the national level, it would strike a deadly blow to the Los Angeles school district. Perhaps the President and the Congress will listen to what the District of Columbia voters thought of that proposal by overwhelmingly vetoing the idea in their November 3 balloting.

The Los Angeles city schools, second largest school district in the country, with over 540,000 students attending the classes of approximately 31,000 teachers, has all the problems that large districts face. In Los Angeles, as in most large urban districts, the situation is beyond desperate. Unlike most school districts, Los Angeles is gaining population. Most school districts have a high minority enrollment. The Los Angeles school district enrollment is 71 percent, 1 in 4 of whom come from families on welfare.

The Los Angeles school system was in trouble years before the Reagan administration cuts found us lots of company. The children whose families are on welfare are beyond the reach of the safety net. Welfare, health care, and housing programs have also been cut. Public supported day-care centers are hard to find, and the school breakfast and lunch programs have had their portions reduced. Hungry children can't learn while their minds are on their stomachs. Even for those who receive the free lunch, with much of the meat taken out of the funding for school lunches, and the absurd bureaucratic rulings regarding the definition of ketchup, the hot-balanced meal may already be in jeopardy.

For the roughly 5,000 students who no longer can afford the new, dramatically higher prices for lunch—now $1.25 in high schools—it is back to bags. Children of the working poor will be lucky to put peanut butter and jelly in those bags.

Needless to say, the health of the child affects behavior in the classroom, and less staffing due to ESSA program cuts take attention to individual problems away from the student, particularly in overcrowded schools. This places an additional burden on the teacher to solve more and diverse problems without being able to turn to the assistance of teacher aides or special program personnel.

The creative title IV program was designed to assist large local districts with the voluntary integration efforts. Without the counselors and staffers in this program, the possibilities for improvement are jeopardized and the trusting students and families will again be discouraged by the inadequacies of the system.

The CETA program was terminated, ending the employment and training opportunities for over 1,000 beneficiaries in Los Angeles city schools alone. This takes employees off the playgrounds, out of classrooms, and increases the workload of already swamped teachers. CETA cuts will greatly reduce staff and equipment on the playgrounds and reverse a trend toward more school activities. Poor youth will again be returned to the street corner society.

We have spent many years trying to involve students in the learning process by making a wide range of offerings. Now we find ourselves turning students away from the routines we put in place.

Vocational education cuts were substantial. These cuts heavily impact on the school district by making it less able to offer meaningful job training to the thousands that flock to the programs each year. There will be less money to buy modern equipment to adequately train participants for today's changing job market. The interdependency of this and the adult education programs to the community and the job market makes decreased funding the wrong way to go. This particularly affects poor students who don't have the resources to obtain job training outside the public school system.

It is demoralizing for students thinking about entry into vocational programs that are closed due to overenrollment. Again, we are turning another group of students away, and they will leave high school with less skills than they could have had, had the programs been available. The long-range effects are that we potentially place another group on the welfare rolls, which would be a cost much higher to society.

The elimination of impact aid takes one more important possibility away from the Los Angeles city schools. We simply have one less tool—a flexible, noncategorical fund at our disposal to target specific problems.

The condition of the physical plants have gone downhill. They are unsafe. The paint is peeling. Some classrooms are in basements, next to boiler rooms, and too small and distracting to provide an effective atmosphere for education to take place. The unclean, dilapidated buildings reinforce the negative attitudes inside the classroom. It is quite difficult for a teacher to ask for discipline when the surroundings are a joke. The physical environment damages morale and makes it hard to promote pride in learning.

Our message is rather simple. We lack the resources at a time when we need more resources. We need more schools, books, supplies, more teaching staff. We need to pay our teachers a better starting salary, so we once again can attract the best college students to pursue the field of education.

Perhaps we should be talking to the top 20 percent in the graduating classes of major American universities and ask them why they are not going into education. There is currently a shortage of math and science teachers. Why? It is obvious. These two fields specifically are paying far better in private industry. Federal aid to education and aid to colleges could once again change all that.

Public education has taken on a greater role in child development. There are more single-parent families, more families with both parents in the workplace, leaving less time to give to their children. That new central role in the students' lives needs additional Federal support. Federal cuts are wrong and the timing is equally wrong. We are not cutting luxuries; we are cutting necessities.

The Federal cuts must be stopped. We wouldn't allow a surgeon to do his or her cutting without having gone to medical school. Why, then, should we allow the wholesale cutting of educational funding without first asking the experts—rollbook-carrying teachers—where the money should be spent and how we can improve educational programs. The Department of Education has succeeded only in cutting itself, and not in serving a role as a chief defender of education programs in this country.

We call for a moratorium on cuts because funding at the 1980 level is totally inadequate. Instead, we propose the formation of a panel consisting of rollbook teachers to create a more effective approach to educational program funding, to set priorities and create more and better programs for classrooms.

The new administration and the Congress funded a beefed-up defense program in the name of national security. Well, what would our national security be like with an ill-nourished and under-educated work force? In a modern, highly technological society, the first line of defense is a quality education, not a system that is going under.

It is not time to return to the one-room schoolhouse; rather, it is time to reassess our national priorities and help the teachers educate. It is time to invest in our youth; not save money at a great cost to their futures, and everyone else's.

If I may just emphasize a few points, as was discussed earlier, there have been tremendous cuts in the CETA and vocational education and job training programs in Los Angeles and nationwide. You probably know there are many technological industries moving into the future in America. An example might be the word-processing industry, and many of you gentlemen I noticed when I was in Washington have that kind of equipment in your office. It is a multibillion dollar industry for the 1980's.

Yet in Los Angeles we have 50 high schools the majority of which have manual typewriters, let alone electric typewriters, let alone the kind of word-processing equipment so that a person could acquire a job in that burgeoning industry for the future.

Food programs. You have heard many comments about it. From the teacher's perspective, it is really quite simple. If the child is hungry, his mind is elsewhere. If his mind is on his stomach, we are not going to be able to do our most effective job educating children.

High schools are another serious problem. You may not know this, but in the Los Angeles city schools, our graduation credits have gone over a period of years from 180 credits to 165 credits. Many of our seniors go home at noon now because of the requirements. Unfortunately, they aren't getting the kind of education that you and I may have had an opportunity for years ago.

We don't have the resources to really supplement the program with the kind of vocational training we need and the kind of cultural training we need. It is unfortunate that in addition to back to basics, we have cut out what I think are very important programs in America. No longer do we have the kinds of music and drama and creative arts programs that are really necessary to give our society a well rounded education.

Another problem with the Federal cuts is the example it is setting for the States. You may have seen the comments of the Governor of Illinois, Mr. Thompson, regarding Federal cuts. His impression is that if this is the kind of leadership the Federal Government is putting forth, if he is going to tell the American people that education is now a lower priority at the Federal level, then why should it be a high priority at the State level? Where are we going to set our national priorities? If the Federal Government is taking the leadership in cutting, it is a sore example for the States.

Impact aid. In Los Angeles we get $2½ million in impact aid. What it does for us is, it gives us a little flexibility. As you know, those are general category funds. They are not targeted to any specific problem. It gives us the latitude, if you will. I might add, the argument from the Reagan administration on flexibility has now been taken from us. The impact aid of $2½ million is now not there to target specific problems in the city of Los Angeles.

Teacher shortages. I alluded to it earlier. Our society and our national priorities are not to pay the teacher his recognized worth in society. He is not receiving the same kind of remuneration as other professionals—engineers, mathematicians, accountants. I had a student teacher last year who would have been an excellent teacher. He had a job offer with the Los Angeles city schools at $13,000 a year. He had an offer as an accounting assistant at Litton for $20,000 a year. Naturally, he made an economic choice and went for the $20,000 opening with Litton Industries.

This is unfortunate, and it is another comment on where our priorities are in this society.

The other part is the lack of respect. Not only are we saying in our society that the teacher is not worth as much as an accountant in an economic sense, but we also have lost the respect. The attitude in many cases in some levels of government and the public is that the teacher can do all these things with less resources, and yet the teacher is the one who is in the classroom every day trying to deal with these diminished resources. We must elevate the position of the teacher in society again.

That is the end of my remarks, gentlemen. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Mr. Zimmerman. Mr. Perkins.

Mr. **Perkins**. Let me compliment you, Mr. Zimmerman, for some excellent testimony.

When I went to the Congress in 1949, the good teachers from my area were all leaving. The unemployment rate was the highest in the United States, 30 to 40 percent, because the rail mines, the coal mines, were all closing and there was no demand for coal. The oil shipped into the country at 50 cents a barrel at that time was replacing coal. Our teachers in the dilapidated coal-producing communities were all leaving those small communities and going where they could get better salaries.

We struggled for many years trying to get a Federal aid program, and that is just about the same situation that we have in many sections of the country today. Here in Los Angeles you have had some good programs. They are all being cut back.

I am just wondering if this isn't enough to discourage teachers. It certainly was in the late 1940's and 1950's in my region, where more than 60 percent or 70 percent of the rail mines all closed, the people were just completely out of work, and there was no tax base at that time. Is this situation today, with these cutbacks, discouraging the good students from entering teaching and the good teachers from staying in the school system? It has been stated that you need maybe 500 new teachers here this year.

Are these cutbacks, in your opinion, having a disastrous effect from the standpoint of recruiting teachers that you really need; that they may get discouraged and go into other businesses? They see the salaries may be better in other businesses and teachers' salaries are not competitive. Do you wish to comment on that situation?

That is all I have to ask you, and you have given us excellent testimony. I agree 100 percent with what you stated, but I would just like you to comment on that problem.

Mr. **Zimmerman**. Thank you.

I think in terms of recruiting future teachers there are two problems, the one being the economic problem of competing in the marketplace with the dollars, where a beginning teacher with 5 years of education is only receiving a $13,000-a-year income. As you know, a family of four on welfare, at the level of $15,000, could receive food stamps. Unfortunately, we have a teacher with 5 years of college falling within that range.

The second part of the problem I honestly believe is the lack of respect for the teaching profession and the teacher in particular. There are many less internal rewards for being a teacher. It used to be—when you alluded to the 1940's and 1950's—even though the pay was low, there was much respect in the community. Everyone felt that this was an extremely valuable service and everyone appreciated the teacher.

Unfortunately, society has changed a little bit and some of the problems in society are now perceived as being someone's responsibility other than the family. The teachers have been one of the groups that have borne the brunt of that attitude. We are given the job of educating the youth. We have a multitude of problems. We have alluded to those this morning. And yet at the same time we have none of the control, none of the resources. It is just 1 teacher and 30 or 35 or, unfortunately, even 40 students in a classroom with really not the kind of tools to do a good job.

So I think that is one of the problems, that we can't attract new people to the profession because the profession doesn't look, in the mind's eye of many teacher-job seekers, like the kind of exciting job that it might have been in the past.

In terms of current teachers in the classroom in Los Angeles, there is a thing that I think would be a better response, and that is, teachers are somewehat demoralized but primarily frustrated. All the teachers I talk to are frustrated because they want to do a good job. They are not there to get rich. They are not there because it pays the best in society. But they honestly care, and they are very, very frustrated, and loss of resources is a perfect example.

I happen to be a vocational business education teacher, and my frustrations at the lack of appropriate tools to educate my students for the technological society and the technological equipment of tomorrow is frustrating. I would not say it is discouraging, but frustrating.

Mr. **Perkins**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a comment.

You talked about the danger of education being assigned a lower priority because of the attitude in Washington which I described earlier in my remarks. I think that is a serious problem. You see daily reminders of the fact that the administrator has placed the Federal role in education at a much lower position.

I think it goes beyond that. You mentioned teachers' salaries. I have 3 children in the public schools in Fairfax County, Va., right across the Potomac River from Washington. At a PTA meeting one night, my son's teacher actually asked me for a job. I reflected upon that. You know, the lowest paid person in my office in Washington makes more than the average salary for teachers in Fairfax County.

That is wrong. We don't have the proper system for rewarding or paying people according to their role in society. I can't think of a professional group more undercompensated than teachers. Before being elected to public office, I was a schoolteacher. We have made gains, but when I look at the average salary in Fairfax County, I just cannot believe it.

Any loss to school districts of revenue from three basic sources, Federal, State, and local, is going to make it difficult to attract and keep a quality teaching staff.

Education is primarily a local function. We want to keep that local function, local control. It is a State responsibility. It is in your State constitution. It is in the constitution in Michigan. But there has to be a very strong Federal concern for a variety of reasons that we have some national goals. Vocational education is a national goal, science education and so forth. We have many clear national goals. I submit education in itself is a national goal.

Because education has been a national goal, it has been funded as a series of categorical programs. Education is a local function, it is a State responsibility, but a very, very important Federal concern.

Another reason it is a Federal concern is the very mobility of our society. A person educated in Michigan can come to California to pursue a career, for example: Yesterday, as I got off the plane, I met a former student who is now working out here in your computer industry.

So they just don't have the right philosophy in Washington right now. The philosophy changed on January 20. Your organization, at the State and local and national levels, has a tremendous job to make sure that we keep ratcheting the priority of education up rather than down.

Mr. **Zimmerman**. Absolutely. Thank you for your concern. I appreciate that.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Zimmerman, on the first page of your statement you say that the schools are not safe. You mean the physical structure or the security or just what is the full import of that particular statement?

Mr. **Zimmerman**. Actually I mean both. In terms of physical structure, if you have looked around many of the central cities of this country you will notice that we are in buildings that are 50, 60, 70 years old. In fact, in California we have an Earthquake Safety Act that required us, fortunately, to get out of some of these unsafe buildings. But many of them are still dilapidated and run down.

In addition to that, in Dr. Handler's testimony he indicated that we spend $11 million on security in the Los Angeles city schools. What he didn't indicate is, we have had over 2,000 teacher assaults, and those are the kinds of problems that reduce the image of teaching not only among teachers but for future teachers.

We have to provide an environment where the teacher can do the job. We have, unfortunately, many nonstudents entering the campus and having motivations other than education to be disruptive, and many, many teachers actually fear for their physical safety when they go to school each day. In fact, we have actually had directives in this city that the teachers leave immediately after school; that they not stay in their classroom and prepare for the next day because they are literally unsafe.

So, yes, both are problems; the deteriorating physical structure and the physical safety of teachers because of, primarily, nonstudents, I might add; some violent students, but primarily nonstudents who enter on the campus.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr Zimmerman, a common perception in the mind of the public is that there is a surplus of teachers. Would you say that that is true? You seem to indicate in the statement that there is a shortage, particularly in some fields. Just what is the fact? Is there a shortage or surplus, or what is the situation?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is a perception which was correct in the early 1970's. When there was an over-surplus, a large surplus of teachers in the early 1970's, a cyclical thing happens. Because there is a glut on the market, a surplus of teachers, less of them enter the educational schools at the college level. Five years later the cycle is diminished where in the local schools we used to have 10, 20, 30, and 40 student teachers, we now have 1 and 2 coming out each year. So that cycle downward has created a shortage.

I also indicated in my testimony that this is a school district with actually a slight rise in student enrollment. Right now we are in Los Angeles short somewhere between 500 and 1,000 teachers for this school year. Those classrooms are being filled by substitute teachers.

So, yes, there is a shortage, and there is a critical shortage in numerous fields. Again, we believe that critical shortage has something to do with the salary we offer teachers and the prestige it has.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

I assume there are no further questions. Again, Mr. Zimmerman, we express appreciation for your testimony this morning. I think it has been very helpful to the committee.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. Our next witness is the Honorable Glenn M. Anderson, a Representative from the 32d District in California, which is actually one of the adjoining districts.

Glenn, we are delighted to have you as a witness today. It is a little unusual for Members who have a few days off to spend their time before committees. We are delighted at your dedication, and we also recognize the fact that not only in Washington but in Sacramento when you were a member of the legislature, and more recently the Lieutenant Governor of the State, that you were always a strong supporter of education and it is a pleasure to have you before this committee this morning.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to welcome our colleague from California before this committee. I have always valued Glenn Anderson's friendship and know his contributions to education in Washington and know how dililgently he works for his constituency.

I think the Congress in general is very proud of Glenn Anderson in their company. All of the Congressmen agree on that, and we are delighted about the contributions that he has made to the whole country, and especially to education. I just want to join in welcoming you here today, Glenn.

STATEMENT OF HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairmen, Chairman Gus and Chairman Carl, and Congressman Dale.

I suppose I could have done this much easier if I had just taken my speech next door to my office because Carl's office is right next to mine, but I have come out to California to make the presentation to you gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, and Chairman Hawkins.

Of course, Carl, you may not know this, but Gus and I go way back. We were seatmates in Sacramento in the legislature for many years. Gus always says the reason I had a good voting record is because he told me how to vote and often voted for me if I happened to be absent. In those days, you know, you could just reach over and push your seatmate's button, and Gus did that, so I had a very good voting record.

But I threw him a little bit because now he has me in Washington, and I am not voting as good as he thinks I should, so he is having a little problem.

George, Congressman Miller, I am very happy to be here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the committee for allowing me to stop by to say a few words on some of the problems, the questions, and the issues of urban education. While I do not have the expertise of the professional educators who are testifying today, I have spent now almost 13 years representing a very urban congressional district concerned with education issues.

My familiarity with the concerns of my constituents, coupled with my position as a Federal legislator, provides a somewhat unique perspective of urban education, and more particularly the appropriate role the Federal Government plays in these issues.

Traditionally, the United States has recognized the crucial importance of public education. Thomas Jefferson may have preferred a free press without government to a government without a free press, but someone else pointed out, or at least at any rate should have pointed out, that the necessary basis for the responsible use of the first amendment, freedoms of press as well as of speech, is an educated population. An uneducated society will produce neither responsible writers and speakers, nor responsible readers and listeners.

This has always been true, and it becomes even more important as social, technological, and political issues have become increasingly complex.

While our country has always recognized the importance of quality education, perhaps paradoxically our National Government has traditionally allowed greater local control of education than is common in other nations. This is due partly to our uniquely federated government and partly to the confidence on the part of our national leaders that education will receive the proper respect in local government.

Our Federal Government, however, does certainly have a role to play. In recent years it has provided approximately 10 percent of the funds spent by the public primary and secondary education programs. Most of that 10 percent goes to programs serving the needs of economically and educationally disadvantaged students under the title I programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Federal Government also funds programs directed at handicapped students and language minority students.

The Congress does not, then, provide a majority of the funding of public education, but it does provide a significant and necessary lesser portion. This already limited role is being questioned on two grounds, one material and one ideological.

First, practical budgetary constraints that are affecting almost all Federal programs threaten the Federal contribution to U.S. public education. Second, the rhetoric of the New Federalism that we have all heard this past year includes a greater emphasis on local control of education.

The first point, of course, is one which cannot be denied. Almost everyone agrees that the size of the Federal budget must be reduced, and the effectiveness and efficiency of education programs should not escape the closest congressional scrutiny. However, I am adamantly opposed to the school of thought that the budget for education programs be arbitrarily reduced by 12 or 6 or *x* percent.

Perhaps there is inefficiency in the allocation of Federal funds. Rather than reducing the funding levels of all programs, let's concentrate instead on identifying the specific problems that must be eliminated.

The second point is a more interesting one. Giving more control of public education to local government does not necessarily mean a reduced financial contribution from the Federal Government. This is the rationale underlying the education block grant that was mandated as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act passed by the Congress this past summer.

As you know, 20 legislative programs for which funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1981 have been consolidated into one grant, to be distributed to State and local education agencies. Basic skills improvement, emergency school assistance, gifted and talented children programs, ethnic heritage, library funding, and teacher corps training programs have all been eliminated as categorical programs. There were appropriated a total of $805 million in fiscal year 1980, $562 million in fiscal year 1981, and have been authorized $589 million under the block grant for fiscal year 1982. The House-passed appropriations bill includes only $521 million. The Senate has not yet taken action.

If you think of those three figures, the one that we spent in 1980 $805 million, and we cut it down by almost $250 million to $562 million in 1981, and now we in the House have only passed $521 million, you can see that in these times when costs are getting higher, we are really going the wrong way.

There are good arguments supporting the consolidation of categorical programs, and not just educational programs, into block grant funding to be used at the discretion of State and local government. The latter are more familiar with the particular problems they must resolve; hence, the allocated funds should be used more efficiently.

There is also, again, the traditional belief among Americans that local communities should control education. However, the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that certain special groups of students are not overlooked. Congressional control of categorical programs guarantees that funds will be targeted at those groups for whom the funds were appropriated.

I am pleased the Congress has not adopted the administration's original block grant proposal that would have included virtually all elementary and secondary education programs except vocational education, bilingual education, and impact aid. I am particularly pleased that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142, has remained separate, authorizing categorical programs that insure that all physically and mentally handicapped children will receive a free and appropriate education.

This has been an important concern of many of my constituents. Let me quote from just two of the many, many letters I have received on this. This is the first one, just a brief paragraph from a person in my district:

"It was a difficult thing for our family to accept that we had a handicapped child, but not nearly as difficult as it was to accept that the help that he needed was not available. My son is now 16 years old, and because of Public Law 94-142, many worthwhile programs are in existence. Please do not allow it to be taken away."

That is signed by Joyce San Paolo, from right in the heart of my district, Harbor City.

Another one:

"God, in His wisdom, gave us the responsibility of a handicapped child, a birth defect that can happen to anyone's child or grandchild. Because of therapy, my child can walk now, and because of therapy he is beginning to talk, and if he can continue to get therapy, some day he will have a skill and work and pay taxes and take care of his own, as I have. For God's sake, for our children's sake, for our Nation's sake, do not repeal Public Law 94-142."

This is from a gentleman, William Appleby, from Marysville.

These are the kinds of communications we get all the time on these and other similar programs.

Those most concerned with this program, the parents and the children themselves, do not want this program eliminated or jeopardized by inclusion in a block grant. The House acted wisely by funding the categorical programs of this act by a total of $1.068 billion, a $43 million increase from fiscal year 1981 funding. I am hopeful that the Senate will appropriate a like amount.

This is just one issue with which I happen to be particularly familiar. There are, of course, many other questions about urban education that must be answered, questions ranging from impact aid to bilingual education to tuition tax credit. I will leave those issues to the more knowledgeable professional educators here today. I will, however, continue to urge my colleagues in Washington and my constituents in the South Bay area to maintain their interest in this most vital of public issues.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would again like to commend you and this committee for holding these hearings and bringing discussion of these issues to the Los Angeles area. I want to thank you for your time and for your attention and I again want to echo the remarks that you, Congressman Hawkins, mentioned earlier.

A lot of people think that when we go home on a Friday afternoon we go home and, I guess, play golf. Well, some of us might, but here is a case of four dedicated Congressmen, Congressmen

Miller and Hawkins and Perkins and Kildee—Gus is the only one really close to home here; the rest all came long distances. I don't think the people in this country know of the kind of work that most of our Congressmen put in. I want to congratulate you for holding these hearings. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Glenn.

Would you remain? I am sure there may be some questions. We are not going to let you get by easily. Mr. Perkins?

Mr. **Perkins**. First, let me congratulate you, Glenn, for an excellent statement.

We have resisted in Washington, particularly the members on the Education and Labor Committee, the block grant approach as vigorously as we could possibly. I think we stalled off several programs from being block granted.

But you particularly mentioned title I and the handicapped program, and I am sure you realize the tremendous progress that we have made in connection with the handicapped program in recent years in Washington through a direct appropriation for the handicapped. We have made tremendous progress, let me repeat, but just suppose that program was block granted.

What would be the effect on the handicapped people in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. **Anderson**. If the block grant included other things, such as school safety—which to many people as well as myself is a very paramount issue—chances are the handicapped programs would be cut. I can see where the pressures and the emotions of the moment would just knock out a very vital program like the handicapped program.

That is why my feeling is, again, that some of these categorical programs that have been singled out by Congress, and particularly the leadership of this committee, ought not to be competing with something else that, at the moment, may be very important.

Thus there are certain kinds of programs, particularly in education, that should remain in separate categories and not lumped together, so that they are competing for one lump sum of Federal funds. One thing they do is say, "You spent $800 million last year. We are going to lump them all together, but only give you $600 million." Well, that means, then, you have to cut, cut, cut, and it just destroys worthwhile programs. A program for handicapped children might not have broad support, since there aren't as many parents of handicapped children as there might be in some other group that could rally support for some other category.

Mr. **Perkins**. We have resisted successfully so far the block granting of the handicapped. However, would you agree that if we let up our resistance and the program was put in a block grant approach, the program would virtually go down the drain. It seems to me that this would be a serious setback, and they would suffer greatly.

Do you agree with that statement?

Mr. **Anderson**. I do, yes.

Mr. **Perkins**. Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson. You have been very helpful to the committee.

Mr. **Hawkins**. If I may add an additional question to that, Mr. Chairman, those who indicate that is a viable alternative sometimes say that if the program is as you have described it, then why wouldn't the people at the local level pick up the program?

How would you answer that argument which is coupled with the other one?

Mr. **Anderson**. I would hope that in some areas they would, Mr. Congressman, but, if funding decisions are returned to the States, I would be afraid that in some areas the needs served by Public Law 94-142—or other essential categorical programs—would not be taken care of.

I would hope in Los Angeles we would be intelligent enough to do it, but I would be afraid, particularly if there were other emotional things that might come in ahead of it. I don't believe the handicapped people—and using them again as the same example—have the broad constituency that some of the other programs do. Most people do not really associate themselves with the handicapped problem until they have a child who is handicapped—I don't know what the percentage is, but it is not very big—and all of a sudden they have one, and through no fault of theirs they now find themselves very much involved and wonder, "Why weren't we involved in this earlier?"

But in the constituency they are not a very big number, and often they find that their money goes trying to help that handicapped child in doctors bills, medical costs, travel expenses, and everything; and they perhaps don't have the money to go out and be active politically like other groups can. So this is one group toward which I think we have a real, definite responsibility.

I don't want my remarks to indicate I am only interested in handicapped children, but I think it is one group which really, really need help.

Mr. **Hawkins**. It is good to have a champion such as yourself at the Federal level.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. **Miller**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Then I assume that you are not hearing in your district either that the block grant approach has enabled the schools to maintain the same level of program with less money, as was anticipated in all of the debate, or at least put forward as a theory in the debate earlier this year in Washington.

Mr. **Anderson**. No. As a matter of fact, I tried to point out we have actually gone the wrong way in our spending, from $800 million to $560 million to $521 million. We are actually going in the wrong direction. We cannot give them only the money we've given in the past and expect them to maintain their service when costs have risen in everything. I mean, they can't even buy gasoline in the local schools any cheaper than we can.

Everything has been going up, yet we are giving them less money for everything than it costs them. I think we are working in the wrong direction and they are not going to save money by giving less money. They are saying, "OK, maybe you can find the inefficiencies better on the local level." Maybe they can, but I think we should do it in another way. I don't think we should do it by using this meat ax and cutting straight across the board so every agency is hit so much, whether they can handle it or not.

Mr. **Miller**. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think, Congressman Anderson, from your many years of experience, in both Washington and Sacramento, you know that once a program is dismantled it is very, very difficult to put back together. I think that is why the five of us have fought to keep separate categorical funding of education programs because it just takes much time, effort, and advocacy.

I can recall our efforts in Michigan to enact Public Act 198 to set up the State handicapped education program. It took years and years and a lot of parental advocacy, to put that program into place. Once you take such a program apart, to put it back together is really a difficult task.

With the fiscal pressure on in States like Michigan and California, eventually block grant funds tend to move from specialized programs into core programs. That is what is happening right now in Michigan. The Governor, after the appropriation process, had to ask the legislature to cut $286 million more from the budget. Much of that came from the schools, and what suffered were the special programs.

We don't know what they are going to present next year, and we have to fight that battle again.

I certainly appreciate your long years of leadership there. You helped me a great deal when I first came to Washington, and I appreciate that.

Mr. **Anderson**. You didn't need much help.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Anderson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. **Perkins**. Thank you very much. We appreciate your appearance.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Glenn.

The next panel will consist of State Senator Diane Watson. Is she present? I assume not.

Assemblyman Art Torres.

Assemblyman, we are delighted to welcome you, particularly to get the State point of view. It is possible that you will convey to us a very optimistic picture of where we can make up a great loss that is being perpetrated at the Federal level, and if so, we welcome you with delight, but in any event, we certainly welcome you as a witness before this committee this morning.

STATEMENT OF ART TORRES ASSEMBLYMAN, 56TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY

Mr. **Torres**. Congressman Hawkins, I appreciate the opportunity to share with you and Chairman Perkins and Congressman Kildee, and my old law school classmate George Miller, what we see here in Calilfornia as to how we address the issues of education and the impact of Federal cutbacks on education.

First of all, I would like to put the discussion in focus and review very quickly for you the recent data regarding the student composition in Los Angeles.

Today the minority has become the majority here in Los Angeles, especially with the Hispanic community, which comprises now nearly 48 percent of the district student population. This phenomenon is affecting our children not only in Los Angeles, but in communities like San Diego, Alameda County, Orange County, and San Francisco County.

There is every expectation, of course, that these numbers will increase in the years ahead.

Between 1967 and 1979, our public school population has been increasing about, oh, 8.2 percent. That increase reflects a number of concerns not only in Los Angeles County but throughout the State. What we as public policymakers at the Federal level and at the State level must be aware of is, of course, how do we deal with this increasing community which has specific demands in terms of bilingual education, also in terms of overcrowded schools here in Los Angeles, and how the Los Angeles City School District has been able to comply with that and, quite frankly, not very well because for the last few years a politicization has occurred here in the city of Los Angeles more toward fighting busing rather than educating our children.

As a result of that, we have had problems especially in the Hispanic communities, in the Chicano areas, in the Latino areas of Los Angeles, where children are in horrible conditions and overcrowded classrooms, which has resulted in parents finally taking up the stand as to what they are going to do and what their responsibility is going to be, along with United Teachers of Los Angeles and groups like that working together.

What we feel here in Los Angeles is that how we deal with that issue is going to be very critical as to what kinds of cuts are going to be forthcoming.

What we feel, quite frankly, is that that kind of economic approach and that kind of rhetoric, this new federalism which gives the States all this authority to hand out crumbs, we feel that that kind of new federalism is, in fact, a rhetorical response to a very serious and concentrated problem which I appreciate Members of the Congress, especially Democrat Members of the Congress, have been addressing quite forthrightly.

We also feel that a change in terms of the Federal role is going to be reflective in the fact that the rhetoric also encompasses that these new block grants are somehow going to make us perform magic, and that is, find new money from heaven, if you will, because by changing the system and by calling it a different name—instead of cutting we are calling it block grants—is not going to give us any money at all.

How we deal with that on the State level is clearly going to be addressed this coming Monday in Sacramento when the Governor has called for a special session to deal with the welfare and the Medi-Cal cuts, and I, as chairman of the Health Committee in California, am acutely aware of exactly what we need to do and what we can do and cannot do.

We also have to be very clear in terms of the impact of these Federal cuts on limited English-proficient children. Los Angeles Unified School District has the largest population of limited English-proficient pupils in the United States. More than 60 languages are represented in the Los Angeles City School District, and almost one-half are Spanish-speaking.

In Los Angeles as well as California, the number of limited English-proficient children is increasing in other counties as well. How those Federal cuts are going to impact upon those needs is going to be clear. We cannot construct a Tortilla Curtain, if you will, across the border between the United States and Mexico to stop the flow of people seeking a dream. The fact of the matter is that we are not going to immerse and deal with the problem of bilingual education by ignoring it or by setting up the 7th Fleet in the Sea of Cortez in order to make sure that people don't come across.

People are going to come to this country for a number of reasons, and they are going to cross fences, they are going to cross battleships, they are going to cross armored vehicles and armored soldiers in order to reach that dream. Once they are here as undocumented taxpayers, it is incumbent upon us to address their needs and their concerns as well.

We cannot, in my opinion, go back to the old days when a minority person would escape to the barrio or to the ghetto and be forgotten by the public policymakers. I think the reflection of the concerns is indicated in the audience here today. We are representative of the kinds of issues and how we are impacted by these Federal cuts.

The other problem which Los Angeles faces particularly is the refugee population. I represent Chinatown and Little Tokyo, as well, in Los Angeles, and the impact of the South Vietnamese refugee population in Los Angeles County has had its impact as well. According to the latest count, on October 7 of 1981, of this year, California had 55,500 refugees enrolled in our public schools, kindergarten to grade 12. Of these, over 15,400 attended schools in Los Angeles County.

When you bring Laotians, Cambodians, Thais, South Vietnamese, Taiwanese, and others all coming into one area, and how to deal with their problems, not to mention the Korean community, which is growing at an increasing rate here as well, we find that not only is that language proficiency a problem, but how do we deal with the refugee program?

Again, we hear the rhetoric from the White House in terms of providing a homeland for folks, yet when it comes to continuing the Refugee Act in terms of funding and commitment, it falls quite short, if not almost zero. How we address that on the State level, of course, the Federal Government has given us a lovely pat on the back but no other kind of support, especially fiscal support.

Four school districts today, Los Angeles Unified School District with 5,773 of those students, San Diego Unified with 5,500, San Francisco Unified with 4,968, and Long Beach Unified with 2,813, account for almost 20,000 of these pupils.

How we address their needs, of course, is going to be impacted by the Federal cuts as well.

We welcome refugees to this country, and I particularly welcome them not only in terms of what we have needed to support them and the efforts of the California congressional delegation in order to support the program, but fiscally we are going to be hurting in that element and that variable as well.

In conclusion, I think that what you have here today are people who are concerned, parents, teachers, public policymakers, public citizens, and people who are concerned about the future of education in Los Angeles, in the State of California, and in this country, and I think that the partnership that you and I have to form in terms of State and Federal cooperation is more crucial than at any other time in our history.

When we consider the impact that education is going to have on our children, whether they are Spanish-speaking, whether they are black or they are yellow or white, whatever color they may be, the issue of education is extremely important, and I do not think that we can ignore the political winds as they are coming from that White House, but I think we are going to have to start our own winds and set our own sails on a course that will lead us to a little bit of humanism and sensitivity and compassion in terms of dealing with the needs and the interests of children in our schools.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Art Torres follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ART TORRES, ASSEMBLYMAN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Art Torres. I represent the 56th District in the California Assembly.

This district includes downtown Los Angeles, Chinatown and Little Tokyo, East Los Angeles and several growing cities, such as Bell, Commerce, Maywood and Bell Gardens.

To give you an indication of the diversity of this district, I represent a large Asian population, comprised of Chinese, Japanese, and a growing number of Indo-Chinese. I also represent one of the largest Hispanic populations in the state. The majority are Mexican American.

This district also has many senior citizens, handicapped and disabled. In addition, the downtown area of Los Agneles has a large number of inebriates.

In these brief remarks, I would like to draw your attention to several federal education issues of major concern to my constituents.

The main focus will be on changes or proposed changes in the federal role in education, with emphasis on: Education as a priority, Local Control, Title 1, Bilingual Education, Refugee Education, and Staff Development.

Who are the students now enrolled in urban schools?

To put the discussion in focus, let me review some recent data regarding the student composition of the Los Angeles Unified School District, the second largest school system in the nation.

Today, the "minority" has become the "majority". When, only a few years ago, Anglo students were predominate in public schools, they now represent 23 percent.

Hispanic students now make up nearly 48 percent of the district's student population. And, this phenomenon is affecting other urban cities, like San Francisco, San Diego, Alameda, and Orange County.

There is every expectation that the numbers will continue to grow, both by natural increase and by immigration to the urban cities.

While at the same time, the Anglo population is expected to continue to decrease due to low birth rates and a shift to private school education.

On a statewide basis, for instance, Hispanics now number more than 4.5 million persons or nearly 20 percent of the population—a number approximately equal to the total number of pupils enrolled in California's public schools, Kindergarten through grade 12.

Between 1967 and 1979, the public school population K-12 increased in California overall by 8.2 percent.

The Anglo population within that group decreased by 26 percent, while the overall minority population increased by 45 percent.

Within that minority population increase in the public school population, there was a 55 percent increase in the number of Hispanic students, and a 90 percent increase in Asian students.

What does this all mean?

To the urban planner, it means that we will have cities in which eight of 10 of the immigrants are Hispanic or Asian. And, that by the year 2000, Hispanics and Asians are projected to comprise over one-third of California's population.

To the urban school district official, it means that the education curriculum and programs will need to be adjusted to a changing school population.

To the urban business person, it means that many products and services will reach urban residents who speak two languages—their native language and English.

To the urban parent, it means that our schools will continue to be an environment of sharing a variety of cultures and customs. And, it will also need tremendous resources from all levels of government and from the private sector, in order to meet the educational priorities of today's youth.

And, to the Representatives from Washington, D.C., it means that students who have received the benefits of federal education programs, comprise a majority in our urban schools.

To actively pursue all of the major cuts and changes in these programs, means that many students will be deprived of a full education.

And, those cuts and changes will affect many people, besides the students now enrolled in our urban schools.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

The Reagan Administration has recently confronted public education by narrowing its role through a massive reduction in dollars, block grant reorganizations, and cuts in protections for needy students.

While federal education is not considered the backbone of public school education, it is entirely appropriate to state as a generalization, that cuts in federal education funding are discriminatory—against minorities, against the handicapped, against women, and against those who most need the help.

And in our urban schools, that translates to a large Hispanic, Asian and Black student population.

The federal block grants and reorganization plans may save money and then, they may not. But one thing is for certain—they will tremendously impact the availability of quality education for students or large, urban settings.

Eliminated are all of the targeting provisions for nearly 44 elementary and secondary education programs that are now combined under the Education block grant.

And, left to the local school boards is the decision whether or not to meet the "special education needs" of: The educationally deprived children, the handicapped children, or the children in schools undergoing desegration.

Another major concern, in addition to avoiding the loss of important and successful programs, is the rush by school board leaders to change their agendas.

One such casualty could be local control. Much has been done in the name of local control.

For me, local control must include substantial parent participation. It is probably safe to say that without federal mandates, especially those in title I, very few districts would have paid much attention to involving parents.

The language in the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act could destroy parent participation as we know it.

Specifically, there are no required advisory committees or other procedural mandates including parental involvement, in developing education programs under the block grant.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the consequences of the Department of Education's proposals in this area.

I also recommend that your Committee, or a Subcommittee, hold a series of hearings on successful models for parent participation in education.

Programs for limited English proficient pupils

The Los Angeles Unified School District has the largest population of limited English proficient pupils in the United States. More than 60 languages are represented. And, almost one-half are Spanish speaking.

In Los Angeles, as well as California, the number of limited English proficient children is increasing each year.

In 1979, the state total was nearly 289,000. By 1980, the number had risen to approximately 325,000. The 1981 figure shows a slight leveling off, but the total is still over 350,000.

While many of the limited English speaking students are now "graduating" into regular instructional programs, is can be expected that these proficiency programs will continue to be needed.

And, this projection is a result of the federal decisions to accept large numbers of immigrants and refugees, who eventually migrate to California.

Until this year, federal dollars expressed a federal commitment to help school districts make the most of the opportunities for the immigrants and refugees under those policies.

We cannot go back to the old days when many said the only way a minority person could "escape" the barrio or the ghetto was to join the military.

Investments in battleships should not be made at the expense of investments in our young people.

The needs are greater today that ever before. I do not believe we should retreat from Bilingual Education and Bilingual Vocational Education.

Urban cities like Los Angeles and San Francisco need federal support for bilingual education, not 25 percent reductions.

Staff development and research is also needed because cities have not focused on them.

And, my constitutents want to re-emphasize to you their determination to learn English and improve their vocational skills. To them bilingual education, or whatever it is titled, is a necessity.

The school districts of this state have felt the intensity of their feeling. Most of them are now willingly implementing bilingual programs.

However, most of the impetus to continue bilingual education programs will be lost if the federal government totally removes its support.

Refugee education

As one might expect, refugee children are concentrated in very large numbers in our urban schools.

According to the latest count, on October 7, 1981, California had 55,500 refugees enrolled in our public schools, Kindergarten to grade 12. Of these, over 15,400 attend schools in Los Angeles County.

Four school districts (Los Angeles Unified with 5,773; San Diego Unified with 5,556; San Francisco Unified with 4,968; and Long Beach Unified with 2,813) account for almost 20,000 of these pupils.

These figures are particularly important when one considers several additional factors:

Almost all of these children have special needs, particularly the need to learn English without losing ground in their subject matter instruction.

California has the largest number of refugees of any state, and percentage keeps growing.

The number of refugees enrolled in California schools is growing rapidly. Between January and October 1981, enrollment increased by 40 percent.

Some preliminary indications from the Reagan Administration expose the real possibility of cutting in half the federal assistance for refugee education.

The admission and settlement of refugees is a matter determined virtually in its entirety by the federal government.

We welcome refugees and we are glad they find California appealing. We recognize that most refugees have special needs and that our school districts are moving rapidly to meet those needs.

Federal funding through refugee programs, Title I, Title VII, and other sources presently allow districts to provide the specialized services these pupils so desperately need to succeed in school and eventually develop meaningful careers.

Dwindling school district revenues, layoffs, and school closings are the pattern in California's urban school districts. We have no place to go to raise revenues, which have been strictly limited since 1972.

Here is a classic example of federal responsibility to meet pupil needs through existing federal programs. But, instead of tying modest federal revenue increases to an increasing population, the Reagan Administration is considering just the opposite.

This is not an area to cut. Nor are the education programs for limited English speaking students.

All attempts to do so must be strongly resisted by Congress, or we will have serious complications in providing quality education to our youth.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Thank you, Assemblyman Torres, for a very excellent statement.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **PERKINS**. Let me agree with you, Mr. Chairman. I just wish to compliment this distinguished legislator for an excellent statement. Maybe when he gets through serving in the State Legislature of California he can join his friend and law school partner, Mr. Miller, in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. TORRES. I would be happy to do that in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. PERKINS. We certainly could use your support. We need your support in Washington. I agree with everything you have stated. You have pointed up the problem 100 percent. George Miller and Gus Hawkins and Mr. Kildee and many others are pursuing your philosophy in Washington hoping that we can do something about it. We have a rough road to hoe at this particular time, but we are doing our best to hold the fort and I hope to see you on my next trip back here, and maybe you may join us in Washington before that time.

But I think your testimony has been very much enjoyed by all the members of this committee, and I hope all the members of the Committee on Education and Labor will read it. Thank you very much.

Mr. TORRES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Art, what you point out in a most articulate fashion is that you have a school district here that is getting buffeted by more than simply this administration's lack of commitment on education, so you are setting in motion other social factors by the funds that have been cut in other areas.

You mention the refugee program. As you know, at least with respect to those from Southeast Asia, it was brought about at a time when people were being thrown out of their country, they were being threatened with their lives, they were threatened with being imprisoned a great length of time and were put on the high seas, and this country made a decision that they were going to bring those individuals here, and a commitment from the Federal Government that the Federal Government would pick up the cost.

You are chairman of the health and welfare committee. In fact, that hasn't happened in California and, in fact, now we see that there is an effort to cut back on the educational support for those individuals.

It seems to me that at some point there is going to have to be a very difficult statement made that it would be very difficult for California to continue to receive these individuals as a result of a national decision if the National Government is not prepared to pay the cost. We can't make, in California, those foreign policy decisions.

Mr. TORRES. We have tried to wake up Senator Hayakawa to that effect, and we have not received any kind of positive support in that direction.

Mr. MILLER. I think it is a program where the problems are going to accelerate for people in the local educational establishments. We have indications that at least they were preparing a rescission in the funding for this program, to go back on the commitment that the Congress made to the State last year, and I think that for especially a school district like Los Angeles, which is absorbing a substantial number of these individuals, word had better be sent to the White House that they had better make up their mind; either bring these people here and support them or you are going to stop bringing them, because you can't continue to have it both ways. The rhetoric doesn't pay for even the first item of service.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Miller, will you yield to me at that point?

Could you tell us some of the reasons why the Spanish population has accelerated in recent years in the Los Angeles area?

Mr. TORRES. Accelerated in population, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, accelerated in population.

Mr. TORRES. It has been a number of factors, because the acceleration is not only coming from Mexico, but quite frankly, increased acceleration in input from Central American countries, as well, and South American countries, so much so that the trend seems to be going in the other direction, rather than from Mexico.

That acceleration has occurred not only because of the economic plight which Mexico is suffering domestically, but also the employment problem which they are suffering in the northern states of Mexico.

We had a Marshall plan for Europe. We had a Marshall plan for Asia. But we forgot about our neighbors to the South. If we would have paid a little attention in the 1930's and the 1940's and the 1950's and the 1960's in terms of the Alliance for Progress, or whatever, and provided some economic development aid, I think we would not have seen the kind of effort that is being made now individually and collectively on the part of many Hispanics trying to come into this country to seek a better way of life.

As a result, they are accelerating here. The other phenomenon is, of course, that they are paying taxes. Recent studies indicate as late as 1 year ago in San Diego County and in Orange County—for example, they concluded a study, and Orange County is not known to be one of the most progressive counties in the State of California—that county indicated that the undocumented taxpayer contributed $48 million in taxes, sales tax, income tax, payment of social security, which is not returned to those individuals, and took out in welfare and other types of social services $2 million.

So clearly it is a double-edged sword. You have tremendous acceleration of population occurring in Los Angeles and San Diego and Orange Counties, but at the same time, if you were to conduct an immigration raid in downtown Los Angeles today you would have a very difficult time finding people to park your car, to serve your salad, to wash your car, to do your laundry, et cetera, because these people are working and they are contributing to the economy.

How you deal with those concerns and how you deal with that issue, of course, is going to be debated in the court in Texas on whether or not public funds can be used or will be used to educate undocumented children, and that question has to include whether or not there is a contribution on their end, and does citizenship necessarily mean lack of taxation?

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you. Excuse me, George.

Mr. MILLER. No problem.

Well, I wish you well in your special session, because I think it is clear that in many ways California may be the test kitchen for Reaganomics, given your problems, the result of the loss of revenues from proposition 13 and the loss of the surplus. You are going to have a very, very difficult time.

The chairman has shown me the recent unemployment figures, which have apparently hit this State very hard. That loss of revenues, at the same time when we are withdrawing, is a challenge which is certainly worthy of you, Art, to come up with a solution.

Mr. TORRES. Well, right now, George and members, the State of California is about $400 million in the red, in deficiency. We have never been in that condition before. That is not counting the Federal cutbacks that are going to occur—$195.6 million of that $400 million is due to Medi-Cal, health care overruns and deficiencies. How we deal with that clearly is going to pose to us whether we raise taxes in a near election year or do we find more ways to cut government, and that is going to be, as George indicated, the test kitchen in California.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Before you leave, and before Mr. Kildee, I want to butt in. When you get into that problem in your legislature this year, I would like for you, through George Miller or Mr. Hawkins, to keep me informed just how you deal with this problem, because your medicare and medicaid cutbacks, all of these educational problems, and all of the migration you have here, I would just like to know how you deal with this situation. Especially since President Reagan came from this State. I would like to know what the repercussions are and how it is solved.

Mr. TORRES. Well, we wanted to send him out of the State, but not necessarily to Washington, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. All right.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Torres, I spent 12 years in my State legislature, and I don't envy those I left behind when I went to Washington. The Michigan Legislature is attempting to solve some difficult fiscal problems.

Michigan is experiencing its highest unemployment since the Great Depression. We are in the same double squeeze that you are apparently getting caught in now, because proposition 13 is beginning to catch up with you.

If the legislature doesn't decide to raise taxes, what areas will they be forced to cut?

Mr. TORRES. The most vulnerable area which we will have to cut in California deals with the category of people called "medically indigent adults." Those are people who are not reimbursed through Federal medicare or medicaid dollars. They are 100-percent general funds of the State of California. They amounted last fiscal year to about a $580-million expenditure on the part of State taxpayers to provide health care services for that group of people.

We would classify those people as basically widows who now find themselves without a health insurance plan because of their husband's death. We would classify in those groups those who are not of age to collect social security or medicaid or medicare because of their age. We also find in that category male adults unemployed, average age about 35. We also find in that category children of either one of those categories.

Those are the most sensitive. What we have to do with that is that I have a massive statewide health insurance pool plan where we are working now with the private carriers to provide a health insurance plan for Californians at about $25 a month to provide for essentially a major medical coverage, not catastrophic coverage, but major medical, based on ability to pay, because that category is going to be the most vulnerable and, unfortunately, the easiest to cut.

The other areas that are going to be cut, in my opinion, as we see it across the board, is the continued aid to cities and counties. When proposition 13 passed here in California, we had a surplus of $1.4 billion. As a result of the time that has gone on under a bill which we called A.B. 8, which was the bailout for cities and counties, we continued to provide funding. Cities and counties didn't feel the brunt of that funding until this year when major cuts had to be made in Los Angeles County, in San Francisco County, and Alameda County especially in health care services, which was precipitated by the fact that we were reaching a deficiency or a balance-due sheet.

What we have now in terms of Monday for this coming session, which is a special session which will last about a week, is to cut in terms of AFDC, cut in terms of medically indigent adults if that needs to be done, and other reforms that we can put into place in terms of our Medi-Cal program here in California.

Mr. KILDEE. When proposition 13 passed, did the State share of education funding increase as the local share decreased?

Mr. TORRES. Well, it didn't increase as much as we would have liked to, to support our schools, but the shift occurred.

Mr. KILDEE. What will the effect be as the crunch gets deeper? Will there be an effect soon on the State commitment to education?

Mr. TORRES. The State commitment to education has been impacted already in terms of our budget process because we had to pit senior citizen and health care services against children in schools. How we dealt with that was very precarious and very delicate, and both parties obviously were not satisfied with the kinds of budget decisions that had to be made.

I think for the most part education did fare all right, but not great, and that still is a problem. So we are faced at the State level of whether we go to issuing bonds, which hopefully people will vote for, or whether or not we will continue to see more cutbacks in education, which I am sure parents and teachers hopefully will not allow, but in terms of where priorities are going to be set, it is going to be extremely difficult, as you indicated quite articulately earlier, for those of us at the State levels to make a determination of whom do we choose?

That choice is going to be ever more pronounced in the next 2 or 3 years in health care in California when we have to choose whether we send $80,000 to a neonatal intensive care unit in San Francisco or we spend the same $80,000 to provide heart bypass surgery for senior citizens in Los Angeles County. Those are choices that are not out front right now, but they are creeping up on that table.

Mr. KILDEE. We don't have any Solomons, either, do we to make those decisions?

Mr. TORRES. No, we don't.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. **Torres**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Assemblyman. Our best wishes go with you to the special session. Unfortunately, that is about all we can convey to you.

Mr. **Perkins**. We want you to keep us informed about what is going on.

Mr. **Hawkins**. The next scheduled witnesses have not arrived. During this interim, may I call on someone who has indicated she wished to testify as a community representative, and I think it is an excellent idea to include individuals out of the audience who have not been scheduled in advance. For that reason, Ms. Estelle Van Meter, who is representing the 82d Street Block Improvement Club, is here and has asked to testify.

Ms. Van Meter, we will be very delighted to hear from you at this point, and if you have any statement already prepared, we will insert that into the record, but I assume you are just speaking as a community representative and without a prepared statement. We will be very glad to hear from you at this point.

STATEMENT OF ESTELLE VAN METER, 82D STREET BLOCK IMPROVEMENT CLUB

Ms. **Van Meter**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members.

I am very pleased to come to say a few words to you because every time the hearings are here, they call the professionals and people who do not live in the neighborhood so you don't really know what goes on out there or how we feel about the things that we are given.

I am certainly not in favor of any cuts, because we have been the most disadvantaged citizens in the country and we do need a hand.

I object to the quality of education in my neighborhood and it is because of many things. One of the things that I really am very incensed about is citizenship that is on the report card, how to behave, morals, and manners. Most of the schools in my neighborhood have overlooked that. Children need to know that they live in a world with other people and that we don't have to be white and we don't have to have a Ph. D. to be good citizens.

When I have spoken to some of these people about this—and I have spoken to many, I am very active in my neighborhood—I want a good, clean, respectable neighborhood to live in. My children need it. They need to know that they should assist in keeping it.

Ninety-one percent of the children going to a high school from the surrounding elementary schools are under achievers and that is not necesssary. So I think that some of these rules, when you send the funds, should add these kinds of things to the guidelines because you can't take the child from these elementary schools and send him to the high school and junior high school when he can't read and doesn't know how to behave.

This is one of the reasons the teacher of the union talked about the schools being unsafe. Now, there are a lot of things that are being tolerated by the schools that should not be tolerated. We came from way down in the woods in Mississippi out in the country, and we don't think there is any sacrifice too much to make to get yourself educated. In this country, if we are willing to work, we will be able to build something for ourselves, and this needs to be stressed to all of the people in all the schools everywhere.

It does seem to me that the persons—not just the schools, but other programs—when you come here you ask only the person who has been dealing with the money. It appears to me that some of these things do not come from the schools. The school will say it comes from the community. Well, some of it comes from the so-called programs that have come. They call it giving you a service, and they get these grants, and then before the citizens living in the neighborhood know they are here, they have spent all of the money on salaries.

Some of it lasts a year and then they start in talking about the stats. They get the police records from the various police divisions in our community and talk about them and when they write up these proposals to send to Washington they say we are on drugs, we are on welfare, and we do a lot of other things, like commit crimes.

That isn't necessary. We have been here for all these years living right out here. You have known me for 40 years and you know it is not necessary and it should not hold true.

We have 95 percent, they tell us, of welfare persons going into these elementary schools. One of the principals told me recently they don't teach the children anything. They don't come to school. They don't even know their names. They can't count to 10 and they don't know their colors. There ought to be some rules for these people who have to be supported by the taxpayers. I think they should be the highest people in the community, with good morals and good manners and behavior and the children should be the best because they don't have to work. This is one of the things.

We talk about the aides. They told us in our community there were going to be persons in our school community. They would know the parents and they would assist in the conduct. They would be the community representative from the school to the community. As soon as they got the law passed, they had the brains, so they got busy and made it open. Someone comes shuffling into my community that lives in Englewood, up in Baldwin Hills, for 3 hours and then they are gone. But if they lived in the community and stayed there as long as I do and work as hard as I do to have a nice community, we would have better schools. I think that is one of the things we need to do.

The union teachers, it is frightening, I suppose, to come to the schools, frightening to stay at my house. I read yesterday in the Times that a lady was waiting, one of the kind of elderly citizens like me, waiting at a bus line and they grabbed her purse. She had her bank book and they made her go to the bank and draw out most of the money that she had. Then some young person showed up at her door and told her that he was a police officer and then he made her go and draw out all of the funds that she had.

Well, these are the kinds of things that are going on in our neighborhood that has got to go. The union teachers, they are responsible, if they went back up here for citizenship and manners.

Children don't want to be bad people. Blacks don't want to be bad people. They just need some training, and this has to come through our local schools and should come with this Federal money. They have to have it.

I have often asked the union member representing schools at Fremont and at McKinley Avenue where I am very active, I am chairman of vandalism, and I have been for 13 years because no one else wants to do it. I want the school protected. We are proud of our school. It is an institution of learning and we should keep it safe. That is the way I feel; that schools ought to be sacred.

But anyway, they aren't, and they have crime there. We have been trying since 1977 to get our educators to give us a special school, one to put the kids that don't behave, the ones that have got the guns, the ones that are in the gangs and the ones that can't function in the regular school, because the principal has to stop and get the police, and by the time he gets through with that, something is going undone that he really ought to be doing along the lines of upgrading the community.

We would like to have that special school, and that ought to be a part of our Federal money.

We have also been talking in our community about a trade school. We think that all of the funds that have come into our neighborhood over the 13 years should have provided us a trade school where people could go learn how to do welding and whatever, the things they know how to do so they could make a living. This is very important.

They sit there and talk about education, but if you are not going to train them in manners and morals and behavior, they are not going to get any education. They are going to continue to be on welfare, which we would like for them not to have to be.

What else do I have here that I need to talk about?

I think those union people should be ashamed to come there as a teacher and do so little in the inner cities. That is not just in my community. It must be all over the country from what I read, things that you read in the Times, and so forth. We are ashamed of them. We want to be safe. We are afraid to go on the bus. We are afraid to go to the grocery store. We are afraid to go to the bank. We are not safe; the children are not safe.

Education should be upgraded and a lot can be done by sending word with these funds, how it is supposed to go.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Van Meter. I know that what you have said comes from the heart and practical experience. I think that a lot of the things that you have mentioned can certainly bring home to us the problems that people at the community level are confronted with and the way they feel about them.

Mr. Perkins?

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you very much for your statement this morning.

Mr. HAWKINS. Just a minute, Ms. Van Meter. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much. I enjoyed talking to you before the meeting and I am glad you came today.

Do you think that parental advisory committees can be helpful to schools on certain programs?

Ms. **Van Meter**. Yes, I do, and I think that they should be required to go to classes and learn something. Schools have tried to do that. I have gone to the class, and the principal comes, and maybe the school advisory chairperson or somebody like that, and they just don't come. But this should be the rule for them to have that is coming with the welfare check. They should be required to teach these kids something, and they should come and learn something themselves. Perhaps they don't know how to keep a budget, how to clean up where he lives, how not to write on the buildings, all of these things.

That is why we are mad at the public schools. We get mad at them, you know, because we want to live in peace. We own our homes. We don't have anywhere else to go and cannot have this.

Mr. **Kildee**. Starting in 1982 title I schools will no longer be required to have parental advisory committees. I think the committees did help in operating title I programs, but the provision for them has been removed from the Federal law.

Ms. **Van Meter**. Sometimes the parent advisory council would consist of the people that have children in the school.

Mr. **Kildee**. Who have the children in their program; right.

Ms. **Van Meter**. But if 95 percent of them are the welfare recipients and they are listening to some other person who wants to get some large sum of money or something, they keep up a confusion. I am not talking about that particular thing because they will come in and they have never earned a dime in their life and they talk about fixing the budget for a public school, which is hundreds of thousands of dollars. They can't do that.

Mr. **Kildee**. You don't think they have the ability to do that?

Ms. **Van Meter**. I think we could have it, but I don't think it should be mandatory, no. That is one of the things I think will help the schools.

But I do think these classes ought to be held and they should be required to come to those.

Mr. **Kildee**. I think the community school concept of bringing the school into the community and the community into the school can help a great deal to provide various services to the total community.

I really appreciate your candid reply to my question and appreciate your coming here today.

Ms. **Van Meter**. Thank you. I enjoyed it.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Ms. Van Meter.

Ms. **Van Meter**. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. **Hawkins**. The plan of the committee is to recess in a few minutes. The scheduled witnesses have been timed. They will not appear until later this afternoon, but may I suggest that when we do reconvene, which will be at approximately 1:30, that if there are other individuals in the audience who would like to testify, depending on the availability of time this afternoon, they should see, Mr. Jennings who is on the end of this table.

If you will see, Mr. Jennings, and indicate that you desire to testify, we will attempt to accommodate anyone even though that individual may not have been scheduled, so that we can get other viewpoints other than the scheduled witnesses.

The committee will be in recess until 1:30 this afternoon. We will have additional witnesses and I hope that those of you in the audience who can return will do so, and that if there are other individuals who wish to testify that you will indicate to Mr. Jennings your desire to testify.

With that, the subcommittee stands in recess until 1:30 p.m. this afternoon.

[Whereupon, at 11:33 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. the same day.]

AFTERNOON SESSION

[The subcommittee reconvened at 1:52 p.m., Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins presiding.]

Mr. HAWKINS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The various witnesses who were scheduled for 2 p.m. and also 3:30 will be, late in arriving, but we do have one or two who have arrived, and I have a name of a witness from the audience who requested to be heard, Mr. Bob Francis.

Is Mr. Bob Francis in the audience?

Were there any other names turned in of other individuals who wanted to testify?

Is Dorothy Rochelle here?

Mr. JENNINGS. She won't be back until the latter part of the hearing.

Mitchell Jackson from the Los Angeles Unified School District Black Education Commission is here.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Mitchell Jackson is here. Mr. George McKenna is not. Ms. Haynes is here.

Ms. Haynes, suppose you and Mr. Jackson—are there any other witnesses in the audience?

Suppose we have you two be seated at the witness table and we can proceed with the scheduled witnesses then, and we will take the rest of them as they arrive.

Would you be seated, Ms. Haynes? Suppose we just proceed with you, and Mr. Jackson, as soon as you are ready, you might join us at the witness table.

Both of you have been long identified with education in the local area, and certainly as chairman of the afternoon session and as a member of the Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee, I personally would like to welcome both of you because of the great contribution that you have made. I think it is a real privilege for us to have you testifying from your particular background.

Ms. Haynes, suppose we hear from you first. We understand you do have a prepared statement which will be distributed to the members of the committee and you may proceed.

May I ask the witnesses this afternoon to speak into the microphone so that those seated in the audience may be able to hear you, because we don't want to lose any part of this testimony. Also, the recorder seated over here has to be able to understand what is going on. If you will do that you will help us.

STATEMENT OF CARRIE A. HAYNES, RETIRED PRINCIPAL

Ms. **Haynes**. All right. I understand I have 10 minutes. Is that right?

Mr. **Hawkins**. Approximately 10 minutes you may proceed, yes.

Ms. **Haynes**. All right. I do have a prepared statement, but I would prefer to speak extemporaneously. I have passed those out.

Mr. **Hawkins**. You may proceed as you so desire.

Ms. **Haynes**. All right.

I would like to speak to the effective school programs and effective schools, school behavior as a critical element in the learning process and educational quality, and the instructional effect of schools for poor children. Naturally, I will be including the role of the Federal Government.

What I am going to do is speak from my experience at Grape Street School because we did develop an effective school. I think everybody knows that Grape Street is in the heart of Watts.

I went to Grape in 1969 right off the list, so I had had no previous experiences. I found a school that was in chaos. A building program was going on. There was vandalism that was part of the curriculum, and teachers who really were not concerned about what was happening to children there.

I began visiting classrooms, which seems to have been unusual, because they tabbed me as the "Walking Principal" right away. I didn't find any instruction going on there. I was able to encourage parents to work with us so that they organized to patrol the schools and they helped to cut down on the vandalism.

I would like to get right into what we tried to do to develop a program there. What I did was, as I went around visiting the classrooms, I made every effort to find somebody who was doing something well so that they could demonstrate for the other teachers, and I began a program in this manner.

I also asked teachers to write lesson plans, which was something they had not been accustomed to doing and which many of them wanted to resist. But as teachers began to develop some lesson plans that were acceptable, then they would demonstrate and then they would come to teachers' meetings and we would demonstrate the kinds of things that teachers were doing well.

We got Federal funding the year after I had been there one semester. One of the first things we decided to do with that Federal funding was to bring teachers in 4 days before school began for staff development. When they came in those 4 days, I had scheduled a calendar of staff development for the teachers for that year. I had assigned them based on an evalulation that we had, an assessment and an evaluation that we had made the year before. I assigned every teacher the responsibility of leading a staff development.

In the meantime, I secured from our superintendent the privilege of dismissing 1 hour early every Wednesday, so for 3 years we had a 1½ hour block of time for staff development. I really credit that as being the key to what happened at Grape Street that helped develop it because the teachers and the staff—not just the teachers; the clerical staff, the custodial staff, everybody who was on that staff—had a responsibility for leading a staff development so far as their responsibilities were concerned.

They led it in such a manner that they could involve everybody there, and this really helped to upgrade and helped us to develop our program.

When I went there, we had many, many children with many problems. Teachers were sending them in recommending that I administer three slots or so. I don't believe in corporal punishment, so right away we had to get busy with developing a discipline policy. Right away teachers said, after the first misbehavior, after I said, "OK, we are not going to deal with it this way. We are going to deal with our behavior in a positive manner."

We took our Federal funds and we employed very competent support people, a PSA counselor—that is pupil service and attendance counselor—a very outstanding young man; a school psychologist and a nurse who supported us in every one of our efforts at the school.

When students were sent to me because of discipline, my PSA counselor began to form a group, first of boys. Naturally, the boys are the ones who come in first with misconduct. He formed a group where these boys could discuss their problems. After a period of time, he organized these fellows into a basketball team.

They were beginning to get some attention. He was collaborating with their classroom teachers so if they were going to play basketball, they would have to follow through with their academics, and they would have to complete it, and they would have to make this commitment. They were beginning to get some attention.

So then the girls began acting up. Well, OK; when they started coming down, we began working with them and organized them into a cheerleaders' group that would work with the basketball team.

From that we began to organize students who had problems in all kinds of different activities that would get them involved so that they would be able to make commitments that they were going to follow through on their classroom work. As we worked in staff development, teachers began to take a very positive attitude toward students and a very positive attitude toward the school program.

We began to organize then into an open classroom structure, and it was based on the teachers' decision that we decided to become multiage grouped so that some teachers had—two of my most outstanding teachers had—grades 1, 2, 3 in one classroom, 4, 5, 6 in another classroom. They organized their classes so that they matched the students to the teacher's personality.

Now, many people don't understand that. Many educators don't understand what we are saying when we say that. But our teachers organized the school so that they had students in their rooms, in their classes, students with problems, students who were high achievers, students who were low achievers. They had a very heterogeneous grouping so that there could be peer tutoring as well as multiage tutoring among the students in their classrooms.

It worked, because we began to raise our grades. At the end of each year we were getting compliments from the superintendent. Beginning in, I believe, about 1973 each year we began to get complimentary letters from Congressman Augustus Hawkins. I am mentioning this only to let you know that we were able to raise our students' achievement level so that it was conspicuous.

We were able to gradually raise those students' achievement level because of the enthusiasm of the teachers, because of the dedication of the teachers, because of the commitment of the teachers, because the teachers accepted the children as they came. They accepted them from what they were, and then they respected them and they expected much of them. Expectancy plays a major role, but it has to come first from the administrator and from the teachers, and if the students know that this is what is expected of them, it will have results.

We were able to get our students on grade level, almost all of them, in 1976, and this was the year that we also worked all year long for a bicentennial tour on which we took 45 of our students. This was a total school project, raising funds to take 45 students from grades 3 through 6 on a bicentennial tour for 8 days and 7 nights to Washington, D.C., and all of the surrounding areas.

The learning that took place that year did evidence itself in those academic scores, in the test scores at the end of the year in 1976.

Now, in 1977, when the OCR mandated that we balance our staff, then we began to run into some problems. It was necessary for us to transfer out nine of our minority teachers because one was an Asian. All of them were top notch who had been involved in staff development and developing our school for about 6 years. So when we had to transfer those teachers out and bring nine new people in, although they were pretty good people, they had not had the background of the other people and it did make a difference in what was happening in our scores.

Let me back up just a little.

After we had had our staff development time for 3 years, the superintendent said that we would have to terminate it. I guess I could understand, although that was really the lifeline of our program, having our teachers get together every week in small groups and work through a program that was beneficial to boys and girls. When he said we would have to terminate it, my teachers had become so accustomed to this that they asked me if I could get a master's program for them. I was successful in getting a master's program for them from Pepperdine University, a master's program which I led, and this was in 1973.

I led that program and our teachers became really involved that year, in depth involved, in continuing to develop the open classroom program which we had and it was very highly beneficial because we had a substantial rise in our scores that year also.

Also, 29 of 30 teachers who began that program received their master's degree on the campus of Pepperdine in 1974. You cannot imagine what this did for their images, for the teachers' images, and as they developed a better image of themselves, they transferred this to the boys and girls.

My only regret, my really deep regret, is that we had visitors come from all over the world to study our program. It was introduced by the CACS Committee. The CACS Committee wanted Grape to become one of the magnet schools, but I don't believe that the Los Angeles City District really ever understood our program. They knew that we were doing something, they knew that we were doing something well, but nobody ever allowed the program that we had developed to be replicated, even during the period of time when there was the desegregation program and we were looking for configurations of schools that could be exemplary.

It was suggested by parents all over the city that our school become a magnet school, but I feel that the location of our school in the heart of Watts deterred that focus and we were never allowed to be a school that could be replicated.

We were successful. On the pass-out that I handed out I just refer to a few of the publications. Newsweek picked us up in 1971 and gave us six pages of coverage. The Christian Science Monitor that same year. We had television as a regular part of our curriculum. We had visitors from all over the world. And we just integrated that into our total curriculum and our boys and girls benefited from meeting people who had interest in them, and also served to boost their image because they felt they were important if people were interested enough to come from all of these different places to see what was going on there at their school.

[The prepared statement of Carrie Haynes follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CARRIE A. HAYNES

The May 3, 1971, Newsweek published a six page article entitled Does School + Joy = Learning. In November, 1971, Curtis J. Sitomer reported in the Christian Science Monitor—"Open Classroom" Successful in Watts—School in Trouble Turns Around. On March 20, 1972, Grape Street School staff and students appeared on PBS Special of the Week, "What Did You Learn In School Today?" produced by the National Programming Division of WNET/13. Syndicated columns, television and radio stations broadcast the success happening at Grape Street Elementary School. Visitors came daily from near and far to visit the classrooms and observe the students at work. Grape Street was a school where children were accepted, respected and expected to learn. Their scores rose correspondingly. Beginning in 1972 they began to rise conspicuously until in 1976 almost all of the students were on grade level.

This change did not come easy. The first priority was set to alleviate the disruptive vandalism which was occurring on a consistent and regular basis. Block Clubs were formed. Ministers, community persons and parents organized to patrol the school or raise funds to pay community youths to protect the school's property. Almost simultaneously it was necessary to help school staff understand their responsibilities to the students. My regular visits to observe in classrooms earned me the title of "the walking principal." My insistence that teachers arrive on time, develop lesson plans and teach students resulted in a large number of teacher transfers. I was as selective as I could be in filling vacated positions. By the fall of 1971 the staff was stabilized with competent and enthusiastic teachers.

That year and each year thereafter title I funds were used to bring teachers on board for four days of pre-school staff training. That fall when the teachers arrived I passed out the year's calendar for staff development. Using information gathered from the previous year's evaluation, I had assigned topics and teacher workshop leaders for each week. Each person radiated pride that they were being involved. During the summer I had obtained permission to dismiss one hour early each Wednesday. This gave us an hour and one half block of time on a regular basis. The implementation of this in-house in-service training took on a professional posture immediately. Leadership skills surfaced. Teachers took pride in student performance. Students took pride in having success. Parents and community rallied their support. At the end of this school year there was a conspicuous rise in the academic scores. Students were involved so we had no behavior problems.

In subsequent years the teachers planned their own staff development and supervised the in-servicing of the education aides. After three years the early dismissal privilege was terminated. At the request of the staff, I secured a graduate program from Pepperdine University. In the fall of 1974, thirty teachers enrolled in a Master of Arts in Urban Education (MUST) Program at Grape Street where we spent one year in further development of our Open Classroom Program. On August 2, 1974, twenty-nine of these teachers received their master's degrees. That year the students continued to raise their academic achievement.

The 1975-76 school year involved students, teachers, parents and community persons in raising funds for a Bicentennial Tour. A related aligned balanced curriculum was planned by staff and implemented concurrently throughout the school term. This year ended with almost all of the students scoring on grade level. Forty-five students and ten adults culminated with an eight day trip to Washington, D.C. and the surrounding historical areas.

When our district began its desegregation efforts in 1977 I was asked to write a configuration of our Open Classroom Program. The committee who received it could not understand our organization of matching students to teacher style or the manner in which we used our auxiliary staff to interface and support the program. Consequently, the program which we had proven could work and be successful, was discounted and discarded in the round file by the school district.

During the school years of 1972 and 1977 visitors came daily from all parts of the city, state, nation and the world to roam through our multi-aged/multi-graded classrooms observing students involved in their learning. Instead of allowing this to be an intrusion, it was incorporated into the curriculum. Students learned to be hosts and hostesses. Their oral expression was enhanced. They reinforced their art of questioning. Staff morale and student self-image blossomed and flowered.

Every conceivable individual, group and community resource was incorporated in the school program. A Kawaida Program from Martin Luther King Hospital-School of Psychiatry counseled with 20 students and their parents. Westminister Neighborhood House picked up students for after school programs, neighborhood churches gave respectable prizes for contest winners, senior citizens formed tutoring groups; Sons of Watts provided protection, Block Clubs proliferated and guarded students to and from school The School/Community Advisory Committee grew strong and effective. Legislators encouraged and supported us. Assemblyman Leon Ralph expressed his concern in many significant ways. Congressman Augustus Hawkins maintained regular contact by visiting, bringing guest Congressmen to show us off, congratulating us in writing as we raised our test scores, sending us flags that had flown over the Capitol Building and with innumerable other tangible means of support.

In 1977 when the Citizens Advisory Committee on Student Integration was formed, one of their first recommendations was to make Grape Street a magnet school. District authorities chose to ignore this request. While Ministers of Education came from countries such as Japan, West Germany, Australia, England, Nigeria, Senegal and even South Africa to study our program, the LAUSD looked on as if it were a program that just happened without being within the perimeters of the top staff planning, and so it could not be accepted for replication.

During a question and answer period when John Greenwood was campaigning for a seat on the Los Angeles Board of Education he asked "Who is Carrie Haynes?" he continued, "If I had been Board Member at the time she was principal at Grape Street, I would have recognized the program developed there as a successful one and set up the machinery necessary to encourage the replication of the process used in its development in other schools." This did not happen.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Haynes.

In the meantime, if I may back up just a little, Mr. George McKenna, the principal of George Washington High School is here. He excused himself from a very important activity in the school.

Mr. Jackson, I wonder if your time is not as important or as urgent as his if we could simply let him testify next so that he may get back to the school, if that is satisfactory to you. He was a scheduled witness at the 2 o'clock time and I did agree to cooperate to the extent we possibly could.

Mr. JACKSON. That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. HAWKINS. So, Mr. McKenna, suppose you make your presentation and then we can then get back to Ms. Haynes and then hear from Mr. Jackson.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE McKENNA, PRINCIPAL, GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. McKenna. I appreciate that, sir. My time is not that pressing, but I do need at least to be back to my school around 3:30 or so.

Mr. Hawkins. Well, if that is so, then there is no great problem. You go ahead, and then we will hear from Mr. Jackson, and then question all three of you at the same time. We will let you out before 3 o'clock. Is that all right?

Mr. McKenna. That is fine.

Mr. Hawkins. OK.

Mr. McKenna. I have a handout that I passed out which may be read at your discretion.

I think that what I would like to say to the committee as the principal of an inner-city school and as an educator who is a product of what I will call segregated schools all of my life, having been raised in New Orleans and having been a product of public segregation for the first 16 years of my life, I think I am well able to talk about the advantages and disadvantages of segregated education and education in general as it relates to inner-city schools.

I think that most of the problems that the United States encounters now has to do with the education of minority children. I am still of the mind that the minority child of which I speak, where the greatest problem lies is with the black child, meaning no disrespect to those who wish to call themselves minorities either because it is fiscally fashionable or financially feasible to do so, because money is available for whoever can prove they are a minority.

We black people have no problem proving who we are because small amounts of blood in blackness makes us black. Therefore, the biggest problem as I see it today, if I may use one word, which may be controversial, is racism as it relates to an entire school system and to an entire country. It manifests itself in many ways, even from board of education members who say that we expect, we anticipate, that the reading and math scores will rise in the district when those children who have run from mandatory busing return. If you believe that statement, that means that only white children can make scores rise, and the presence of black children automatically presumes that scores will fall or remain at the lower level.

We run into situations where unions want to maintain the status quo, protect teacher positions and jobs, and the status quo means that a certain group of people are on the bottom and the others are served very well at the top.

If I can complain all day, I would bore you. What I need to do is try to give you some solutions to the problems. One of the things I think you need to understand is that no program can be replicated on one piece of paper that another piece of paper will also prove successful. What I am saying is that only bodies, individuals, persons, can make programs work. Rand Corp. cannot come up with reading programs that mean anything unless there are people in there to make those programs work and, therefore, who teaches the child—who teaches the child—is more important than all the other wheres, whens, whys, and hows of education.

Who is the teacher? That comes from who is the parent also as the ultimate teacher, and who is the parent in the school. Who is the local parentis individual? I see no benefit in saying to an all-black school in an urban ghetto situation that it is to your advantage in any way that the Office of Civil Rights mandate forces that the majority of your teaching staff must be white. That is of no advantage to the child. It is of no disadvantage to the child if all the teachers are capable.

I have no problem with people being white or black in terms of their capabilities. I do have a problem with the fact that only in inner-city schools does this become a non sequitur to me. Why is it important to the child that the majority of the teaching staff be white? If it is important to integrate schools at all, why is it so important to integrate staffs and yet admit to the fact that racially isolated minority schools are in fact existing and legally given credibility by saying we can't do any better and we refuse to? We will spend a lot of money doing other things other than integrating schools.

Saying all of that, saying that what is most important, well, first of all, who teaches the child? We in the school districts need the flexibility to determine more effectively who will teach our children, and for that I call for, urgently appeal for, more community input into who works in the schools.

I think we are servants of the parents. Although I am the principal of the school and am given certain powers and authority by the education code in the State of California, I am still a servant of the people who pay my salary. If I lose sight of that, then, in fact, I think I am something more than I am, when in fact I am only a servant; a higher priced servant, but still a servant. It means that I must be more sensitive to the needs of the people.

If the community does not want me as the principal, I should not be the principal. I should not be superimposed upon a community and say that the community will have nothing to say about who the principal is, they will have nothing to say about who the teachers are. I think that is ridiculous.

Certainly I have the ultimate say-so on whether a teacher gets an unsatisfactory evaluation, but I think that the community should be in the first situation when the teacher is interviewed. The community should have an interviewing situation to determine who is the principal of a school. What use is it for me to pass a unified school district test which has no community input at all? To test what? To test how my colleagues think about me. If I am a member of the "Good 'Ole Boys Club" I will be principal forever.

There is no evaluation process for principal right now

The superintendent doesn't know what I am doing in my school. I could be stealing money. He will find out 10 years later when an audit comes. By that time, 10 years worth of children will have been destroyed, which is happening every day in certain situations, not because of the principal necessarily, but because of what is happening in the schools.

So the community needs a definite input base into who works in the school. And we need not be afraid of the community. They are not to be construed as being ignorant. That is a racist point of view. Black people as well as white people as well as Hispanic people as well as other cultures are all capable of racism, and if we are capable, we are sometimes guilty of it. Racism in the negative sense I am speaking of, where the expectation of a certain group of people is different from another group of people.

Some of the teachers that I had to remove from my school were black. More were black than were not black, basically because their own racism had let them assume that the quality of black life is not as important as the quality of white life, so their expectation for themselves and their kids was less than what I would expect, and they had to go, too.

It makes no difference to me what the color of a teacher's skin is. I stand before you as someone who has been mistaken for being something other than a black man, and I never heard a child call me out of my name or say that I was unfair to him, even when he thought I was something else, which says to me it doesn't mean any difference what the child thinks I am. If I treat him fairly, he or she will respond to me.

I know, of course, that there are situations that we cannot control in individual matters, but I urge us to put into effect teeth into the situation to give the community control.

Another point of view that I wish to express is what is the role of the outlying business communities? I would urge for some proposals that I put in here. I would like to see more parents being allowed to come on school campuses. It is one thing to welcome parents; it another thing to involve them.

All principals say parents are welcome. When you ask them the last time they talked to any parents in a meaningful way they say at the last advisory council meeting. Well, 6 people showed up and there are 2,000 parents in the school. What is the outreach? Well, principals are frustrated. We don't know how to get the people out of their homes.

But the district doesn't provide for educating the parents. We simply educate children, send them into homes that know nothing about what we are doing. If we are truly serious about educating, we need to find ways to get the parents out of their homes.

One of the proposals that I have tried to elicit around town with politicians is, if in fact we can subpena parents who work to come to court and sit 2 weeks, 3 weeks, waiting to be called on a jury, and sometimes never get called, why can they not be given 10 days out of the year to come to school if they have children in the schools and their employer simply allows them to do that? It might not be able to happen in a "Mom and Pop" store because they only have one employee, but if most parents—and I am talking about black parents now who have the greatest problem, as I see it, and Hispanics also—most of us work for the Government anyway. The Government can be the first one to do it. If we work for city hall, why can't city hall do it? If you are really serious about it, why can't the chamber of commerce do it? If, in fact, you want better products to work in your businesses, you should be interested in having a better educated product, and the presence of a parent in a school will produce a better educated product. You won't have as many functional illiterates.

Picture utopia. Every school and every classroom on any given day there is a parent sitting in the room. Don't you think that the quality of education would improve in that classroom on a daily basis? Whether the parent knew the subject matter or not, the mere presence of a physical body. As the principal of a school, it is extremely difficult for me to physically see an unsatisfactory lesson being performed. My physical presence in the room makes it a totally unorthodox situation for the teacher. They put on the best show they can, for which I don't blame them. I would, too, given the kind of principal I am.

But when I leave the room, there is another thing that goes on. If you talk to the kids, they will tell you that a lot of nonsense is going on in the classroom, and the evaluation process that is available to me does not allow me to do very much about it unless I catch the teacher in the act, which is very difficult to do since I am not an invisible person.

There are other kinds of constraints, and I have tried to outline some of my proposals in my treatise here, which was prepared a few years ago; not a few, maybe 2 years ago.

We have begun a program here in Los Angeles that you might be interested in which was an outgrowth partially of this document that has been implemented in area 3. Area 3 is under the superintendency of Phil Jordan. There are three schools in area 3 that have been converted into quasi-preparatory schools, and in two cases preparatory schools. Let me briefly outline them for you, 95th Street Elementary School has been turned into a preparatory school. It runs K through 5. It feeds into Brett Hart, which is now a preparatory intermediate school, grade 6 through 8. The ninth graders have come to Washington High, of which I am the principal. So Washington High is now a 4-year school.

This is the first year of the program. It is intended that each one of these will feed into the next level and over the years we will have a series of feeders. Washington High has magnet schools, by the way, magnet centers, and I will talk about that briefly. The hope is to raise the academic level and achievement expectations of the children in each of those schools in a typical inner-city situation.

The key to it was to be able to hire—and we call for zero-based hiring; that is, start the teaching staff from scratch. Let the principal and the community pass judgment on who works in the school. We came as close to that as we could; 95th and Brett Hart were allowed to hire their teachers from zero base. Washington High, where I am the principal, was allowed to at least hire additional teachers to accommodate the new ninth graders, which was equivalent to zero-based hiring, but not for the entire staff.

The emphasis there is to create a nonprivate school situation, but the expectation that is sometimes present in a private school. I take issue with modeling schools like Marva Collins in Chicago, although I have no problem with Ms. Collins, but the danger of that is that once you get to the point where there is a waiting list, you then have a tendency to want to select the best of the group and, therefore, you have a private school situation. We need to be able to take our children where they are, with whatever their problems are, and provide resources for them, not kick them out of school because they don't fit our mold. We need to be able to have resources to do that.

Another program that distresses me greatly in the Los Angeles Unified School District is what is called the mandatory integration program, which is another form of racism where you bus 15,000, 18,000 black kids, minority kids, every day to the valley, and we voluntarily submit to that, so I guess we have no one to blame but ourselves as black people. But why do black people leave so fluently out of their own area.

The PWT program strips the inner-city school of its greatest resources, academically oriented students. Let me give you an example. Washington High School has 1,400 students per day that are bused out of our school voluntarily. Crenshaw High has 1,700 per day that are voluntarily bused. Those two schools combined comprise 20 percent of the total busing population of the entire unified school district. There are no white children bused into the inner city, as far as I know, at the secondary level.

Those students take with them all kinds of resources. If I were to make a suggestion to you about our busing program, I would submit, first, put a cap on the number of students that are allowed to leave any one school. Theoretically, if the entire population of Washington High chose to get on a bus tomorrow, the valley would accommodate them. All you would have to do is have enough room to accommodate them in the valley and the entire inner city would be wiped out and all the resources would go to the valley. All the additional programs would go to the valley.

Second, if you put a cap on it, make a random selection of those kinds of students that are allowed to leave. Example: If you tell me that Washington High can only have 500 students leave, at least I know what to prepare for, and I would give every student in the school a number. The first 500 numbers that were picked would get to leave. That means all the doctors' kids would not be able to leave, all the lawyers' kids would not be able to leave. It would be a random sample and the valley would have to not be able to handpick the kinds of kids they choose to be integrated with. The expectation level is different in both situations.

I was asked a question by a reporter who said to me that recent statistics show that in the University of California system, we did a study on minority students who were freshmen. Here were the results, and you can make your own conclusions. Results were the following:

You took a sample of minority students who came from inner-city segregated schools. Another sample of minority students who came from integrated schools. They both had the same grade-point average when they left the high school. At the end of the first year in the UC system, the minority kids who had come from the inner-city schools had a lower grade-point average than the minority kids who came from the integrated schools.

His question was: Does that suggest to you that the kids who came from the inner-city schools were given grades and did not really have those grade-point averages, those B-plus grade-point averages, 3.0, as they were purported to have? Does it suggest that grades are given away in the inner city?

I said:

> Well, it depends on who are. That is one way to look at it. Let me give you another point of view. Does it suggest to you that perhaps the students in the valley

who were minority students were not given the grades they should have been given in the first place, because there was no expectation that they would be valedictorians, and instead of being given A's like they should have been, they were given B's, and consequently they both came out with a 3.0 average but perhaps the child in the valley was supposed to get A's and was supposed to be the valedictorian, but the expectation of his taking physics and chemistry is nonexistent and, therefore, he was put back into a B-plus status. Consequently, when they both hit the university, they both said they had B's, but I dare say that it means the inner city is giving away grades to the contrary. If so many kids fail in the inner city, why would we be giving away grades?

But if you perceive it that way, you can perceive racism or you cannot perceive racism. Our mayor asked a question a few months ago of a group of black educators. There were about 500 people in the room, broad experience in the inner-city schools. He asked them, "When is the last time any of you saw a white custodian working in your inner-city schools?" Nobody raised their hand. Never had seen one.

The question was: What do you think? Do you think that white people don't do custodial work in this unified school district? You see white electricians. You see white painters. You see white teachers. You certainly see white principals. You see white office managers. You see white cafeteria workers. But you never see white custodians in black schools. Why is that? Is that because it is not in the best interests of black children to have them see white people pick up their trash?

But if you don't perceive that as a racist point of view, you never assume that is a problem. You presume that the teacher is feminine. You presume the custodian is black. And you make some other kinds of presumptions that are racist and sexist. The bottom line is that we need to revamp the entire system, but not so much by revolution. Internally it can be done with some consciousness raising. But it doesn't have to do with talking about what feels good for kids and what feels good for teachers. It is what is good for kids, and teachers have to adjust to that.

I do not believe that a teacher is demoralized by hard work. I do not believe that a teacher or a system is demoralized by the demands upon them. Yes, I do demand lesson plans in my school. Yes, we have done some successful things at Washington High. In the 2 years that I have been principal we have reduced violence and vandalism more than any other school in the district, minus 23 percent the first year, another 14 percent the second year. That is the statistics of the Los Angeles Unified School District. You can read them for yourself. This is not simply things I have made up out of the air. I could go on and on.

I think that one of the other things that you need to address is the problem of safety in the schools. The majority of black people, I think, leave their own communities because they think the schools are not safe. They in fact will not be safe unless we address what really exists. There are certain things that exist called gangs. Gangs exist. If they exist, let us not keep trying to address them with people with pupil services personnel credentials as their only criteria for addressing problems in the school. You need people who understand what the functions of gangs are, who can relate to young men because it is a young man problem, young black male, young Hispanic male. That is the problem. That is who you are afraid of. That is who other 15-year-olds are afraid of. If a 15-year-old told you today the thing that they fear the most, they would not say the bogeyman, they would not say the police; they would say another 15-year-old, because they are the most murderous people in our society today, not because they want to be; but because we have nothing to address them. Unless you are willing to put gang diversion programs in the schools, you will always have gangs.

Sometimes I believe in my own small way that maybe we don't want to change things, because if we had no such thing as non-readers beyond the third grade in America, there would be no need for remedial reading programs. A lot of people would go broke. If you didn't have gangs, there would be no need for police officers to the extent that we have them. We don't need more police officers on the campus. What we need are community people on campus walking the halls. They need to be paid to do that. If we keep saying you people ought to volunteer, well, you people are working hard every day, so how can you people volunteer when all you have is a single parent working in a home with five or six kids, who has to go to work. How can they keep coming to the school every day to volunteer to clean up the bathrooms and the marihuana and all the other things that go on?

We have our priorities in the wrong place. Area advisers and all those other people that push paper around every day, I question as to whether or not they really have a legitimate right to call themselves educators. My concept of an educator is somebody who can walk away from their work station and within 1 minute put their hands on a product, a child. If you can't do that, then you aren't an educator. You are something else. And be willing to admit that you are something else. But unless you are working with the child, then you are not really an educator. You are an implementer, you are an administrator, you are some kind of other person, but that is not what you do for a living.

We need to have more resources in the schools. The schools are the place where everybody gets to go. Criminals, saints, everybody in the world, has one thing in common. They came through school. All criminals don't wind up in jail. All sinners don't ever go to church. So the only place where you will ever find every kind of person in the world is a school, and that is the place where these programs must start.

In my proposal, I have outlined some responsibilities not only for the school, but for the business community, for the parents, for the students themselves. Our children are only a reflection of us. If we mirror a negative image to them, they will implement it exquisitely, and to their own detriment, in fact. There are lots of things that we can do, but we have to do them now, because in 1990 we will wonder where the 1980's went, and they will have gone down the tubes again with another several generations of illiterate youngsters unless we are willing to begin to take some drastic steps right now.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of George McKenna follows:]

Prepared Statement of George J. McKenna III, Principal, George Washington High School and President, Council of Black Administrators, Los Angeles Unified School District

I. OVERVIEW

Objective: To provide a plan to address the needs of racially isolated minority schools. To establish a working model which may be imitated and implemented on a District-wide basis.

Rationale: A current working model is necessary in order to establish a standard for excellence for all RIM schools which is more than conjecture and hypothesis.

Plan: To identify one or more target communities in which a senior high school and its predominant feeder junior high and ultimate feeder elementary school are utilized as the experimental community.

In establishing such a target community, consideration should be given to the following:

1. Does the community have a nearby post secondary institution available in order to measure the success beyond high school?
2. Is the community predominately minority and racially isolated?

Responsibility and guidelines will be established on the part of the District, local school, parents, students, business and community.

II. DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To provide a learning situation for the Black child which guarantees educational excellence and to eliminate those policies, practices, programs and procedures which impede this goal.

Rationale: The right of Black children to an equal and effective educational opportunity is a fundamental right, protected in the Constitution and re-affirmed in the courts.

Plan: 1. Remove the Office of Civil Rights and District restrictions which require by law that the school must have a majority of white teachers in a predominately minority student populated school.

2. Hire all faculty and staff from a zero base, that is, no personnel currently employed have quaranteed rights of employment within the school. The entire school staff will be hired as in the staffing of a new school.

3. Allow for the community input in the hiring of all staff, especially the principal of the school. All parents of children currently attending should be invited to a screening session to select the administrative team. An elected group of parents from within the group should be allowed to participate in the selection of all staff in conjunction with the principal. The principal will have the ultimate authority in hiring and evalution of staff.

4. The District should establish a written criteria for the specific qualifications for a RIM school teacher. These criteria should not be general and all encompassing, but rather quite specific in all areas such as community commitment, expectation of student achievement, agreement with community goals and philosophies, and willingness to serve the special needs of minority students. Additionally, the District should utilize these criteria in the recruiting of teachers by the Personnel Unit.

5. The District should clearly establish its commitment to differentiated staffing, and to provide for the special needs of RIM schools. The reduction of the counseling ratio to 150 students to 1 teacher should be an example of the recognition of the need for counselors in RIM schools. Other examples are:

(a) The guarantee of group counselors in each school.

(b) The establishment of "gang" counselors in the schools. Since gangs do exist and are a tremendous influence on the students and community, special persons are needed to cope with the problem.

(c) Establish a full time "Community Coodinator" position to involve the parents and the community in the day to day operation of the school.

(d) Establish a full time student activities coordinator position to provide positive activities for students such as peer counseling, student exchanges, motivational activities and programs, big brother/sister programs and other image building activities.

(e) Provide more school psychologist time. A full time position in each school would be most desirable.

(f) Establish an Opportunity Program in each of the target schools.

6. Establish a quota on PWT students leaving the home school. No more than 10 percent of any home school student population should be allowed to leave the community by virtue of PWT. No school should be drained of up to *one third* of its stu-

dent resources as is currently occurring at Washington High School. Precedence has been established in that quotas currently exist on students transferring on open permits.

(a) Since the type of student who leaves the Black community is as significant as the number of students who leave, a more equitable selection process should be adopted to determine which students are allowed to participate in PWT. As an example: Invoke a lottery system wherein each student in the home school would be assigned a number and the priority choice would be given to those students whose numbers were drawn within the established quota. This would serve to offset to some extent the current practice of predominately high achieving students being bussed in disporportionate numbers out of the home school.

7. Provide easy access of white students to the RIM schools by use of PWT *into* the Black schools. Actively recruit white students to attend Black schools in the target area.

8. Guarantee a safe and secure campus for students, teachers and community. Supervision Aides should be assigned on the basis of special needs determined by size of campus, student population, logistical access to campus and other criteria. Aides should be community based persons.

9. Establish a team approach to the staffing of a school, not the current policy of reassigning a new administrator to a school where the current teaching staff is united in its commitment to personality cliques, teacher apathy and low student expectations. A new principal should be allowed to bring an elite team of teachers to the school in an attempt to re-establish higher standards. As an example, if administrators are in fact to be demoted to the classroom because of budget cuts, they should be organized into a team and placed into individual schools as a unit.

10. Principals should be allowed to select department chairpersons rather than have them elected by teachers as is the policy now. The principal cannot function as the instructional leader if the persons assigned to implement department objectives are selected on the basis of popularity.

11. Provide a smaller class size ratio similar to provisions made in mid-site school i.e. Ratio of 1 to 25.

12. Additional money for supplies and equipment must be allocated. As an example, if the absence and transiency rate is extremely high, more money is needed for purchase of absence report forms, paper for daily master absence lists, attendance accounting forms and other necessary materials. There are numerous other examples of the need for additional monies in RIM schools.

13. Re-define clerical norms to meet the needs of unusually high work loads and demands due to excessive clerical needs. The burden would be taken from the teachers who are currently inundated with clerical functions due to an inadequate clerical staffing ratio based on student enrollment.

14. Establish policy which mandates parent conferences due to excessive non-illness absence of the student from school.

15. One full time Pupil Services and Attendance Counselor assigned to each school.

16. Provide funding for more field trips for students since racially isolated students have limited exposure beyond the immediate environment.

17. Make a 3 to 5 year commitment to this experimental program at the targeted schools.

18. Make a commitment to expand the program if significant measurable results are achieved.

19. The retention of a full 6 period day for all students.

20. Expand student to student interaction programs between Black and White students.

III. LOCAL SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To provide an atmosphere for learning with clearly defined goals for students and teachers, and to promote and develop confidence and self-esteem in minority children.

Rationale: Students learn best in an atmosphere that permits and expects learning. Students cannot gain a feeling of self worth unless there is a commitment to self-esteem as a positive goal.

Plan: 1. Establish a master plan for student and teacher expectation.

2. Establish and enforce a mandatory homework policy.

3. Establish and enforce a workable student attendance accountability program.

4. Establish a flexible schedule for teacher working day to allow for remedial classes after regular school hours.

5. Establish a School Within a School for students who need remediation in reading, writing and mathematics. Adopt a basic approach for students requiring remediation, as in Lau plan.

6. Establish a teacher exchange program between Senior, Junior and Elementary schools to provide remediation and enrichment for students. Example: students in secondary schools who need assistance may be best served by the skills of an elementary level teacher on a visiting lecturer basis. Conversely, elementary pupils may be enriched in specific subject areas by secondary teachers who are specialists in subject matter such as math and science.

7. Establish departmental and subject area continuums and engage in regular staff development and teacher exchange of ideas.

8. Staff development should be meaningful and local school goal oriented. Leadership must be developed from within existing staff.

9. Provide a child care program on campus for the needs of parents who wish to do volunteer work on campus.

10. Establish an "extended family" concept which encourages the involvement of total community into the operation of the school.

11. Adopt the policy that all school personnel are servants of the community in which they work and are employed to meet the needs of the students and community.

IV. PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To establish guidelines for parents whose children attend the targeted schools.

Rationale: If students are to learn the parent must be actively involved in the process.

Plan: 1. The parent must be responsible for the attendance of the child. The school should only be responsible for notifying the parent of the absence of the student, but the parent must assume the responsibility for the attendance of the child.

2. Each parent must commit at least one hour of service per month at the school during the normal school day, for the entire tenure of the students enrollment. (See VI No. 2)

(a.) The presence of parents on campus would significantly if not totally reduce the need for security agents on campus. Parents on campus would serve to raise the feeling of belonging and ownership on the part of students for the local school environment.

3. Parents must enforce the homework standards of the school.

4. Parents must attend all conferences involving their children as it relates to school concerns and agree to parental counseling after school hours.

V. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To establish guidelines for students which would allow the maximum productivity in all academic, cultural, extra-curricular and racial activities.

Rationale: Clearly defined goals must be established if students are to strive for the achievement of those goals.

Plan: 1. All students must attend all classes on a regular basis and failure to do so must result in a parent conference.

2. Students must choose a definite goal i.e. post secondary education or employment.

3. No overt act of violence will be permitted by any student. Failure to comply may result in removal from the school.

4. Student must be involved in peer counseling programs which provide positive interaction with peers.

5. Students must assume the responsibility for the cleanliness of their campus.

VI. BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To establish a clearly defined role of the business community in the operation of the school.

Rationale: If the goal of education is to produce productive citizens in the academic and business world, the business community must commit an effort to establish a relationship.

Plan: 1. Business and professional persons and companies should adopt a school on a regular basis. This would involve providing speakers, resources, possible employment, and other motivational activities for students.

2. Employers should provide released time with pay for parents who wish to provide one hour per month of school service to the school of the childs' enrollment. This is similar to the paid time allocated to employees for jury duty service. Parents on campus will greatly enhance the performance of students and thereby produce a more marketable potential employee resulting in increased business productivity.

3. Employers who hire school age youngsters should utilize the school as the "clearing house" or employment agency. No student should be allowed to work as a substitute for going to school. Adopt a "we hire no drop-outs" philosophy for students who are of school age. Allow the school to be the vehicle through which employment is secured.

4. Establish and publicize clearly defined skills and attitudes which are necessary for entry level employment so that schools may inform and educate students as to the expectations for possible employment. Actively recruit students for employment from within the neighborhood school.

VII. COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITIES

Objective: To establish a vehicle for the active and positive involvement of the total community or "extended family" into daily operations of the school.

Rationale: Those persons most affected by the educational institutions, the students and parents, are least able to effect the outcome of policy decisions which impact upon them directly.

Plan: 1. Community based organizations should make their presence known to the school and offer to become involved in an active way.

2. Churches should not be separated from schools. The separation of church and state should not be a total disenfranchisement from institutions of religious and moral affiliation. Local clergy must make their presence felt in the daily operation of the school program.

3. Community based support groups should be established to provide volunteer support to the local school.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Thank you, Mr. McKenna. If you have the time and can remain, we will certainly be sure to get you out before 3. Is that all right?

Mr. **MCKENNA**. Surely.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Mr. Jackson, let us hear from you and then we will question the three witnesses together. Mitchell Jackson, chairman of the Los Angeles Unified School District Black Education Commission.

STATEMENT OF MITCHELL JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION COMMISSION

Mr. **JACKSON**. Thank you, Congressman Hawkins.

I would like to make a correction at this point. The Black Education Commission is no longer in existence. It is now called the African American Education Commission.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Thank you. I will make that correction.

Mr. **JACKSON**. I have prepared a statement that you have but, like Mrs. Haynes, I would like to talk somewhat extemporaneously also. I think I can cover more territory like that, and eventually you will probably read the statements. I would hope that this committee would read the statements that we have prepared.

Point 1, I would like to address the area of gangs, to which Mr. McKenna has just alluded. The problem has always bothered those of us who are members of the commission because we have always tried to study out and determine what gangs really are.

When people talk about the gangs in the Los Angeles Unified School District, they are talking about a certain number of young, mostly male, black and brown youths. Usually it is the bad or punitive process that comes forth. It is the contention of the African American Education Commission that there are far more serious gangs that are permitted to peruse this city and do far greater harm to the children or the students who are in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

At this point, we have to start at the top when we talk about that gang of people down at 450 North Grand who are called the board members. That is a gang of people sitting together making decisions for people and wreaking all kinds of havoc against those particular students that are in the community.

We also had a thing about the gang of staff persons in the school district who are also carrying out the so-called instructions or directions of that particular gang of school board people.

Then we have to talk about the gang of policemen who are out there patrolling. We have to talk about the gang of principals who are administering a school. We have to talk about the gang of teachers who are in the classrooms who are wreaking permissive kinds of violence against our children in that they bring out what we are presently calling generational genocide. There are too many of our students who are coming out of the schools who are functional illiterates.

I think that area of gangdom needs to be addressed by the Federal Government as well as by those of us who are parents, the gang of parents who are also a part of that total process, just on the gang process, Congressman Hawkins.

Next I want to talk about discipline, discipline in the Los Angeles Unified School District as we perceive it. Everybody talks about discipline of the student, and every time they talk about the discipline of the student it is punitive in its process. The education code is punitive where students are concerned. The general administrative guide of the school district is punitive toward the students where it is concerned. The general pupil personnel policies that are handed out by the superintendent and the board of education is punitive toward students where it is concerned.

In that whole process, we usually deal with what the student is or is not doing, and we completely forget about the kind of disciplines that need to be addressed by those factions when it deals with the teachers and those persons who have the legal responsibility of educating our children.

Most of the minority, or so-called minority, students in the Los Angeles Unified School District are well-mannered children. It is only a very few of them who are put off into that other kind of territory or category that has to be known as discipline, and that discipline continues to be punitive, but nobody addresses the discipline of learning, which is most important and the reasons for the existence of the schools that are in Los Angeles and all over this Nation.

The second point I would like to talk about is the testing, the proficiency ability of students as it is tested in our schools. I am appalled that only until this year has there ever been anything developed about proficiency testing, Congressman Hawkins, when it deals with those persons who are having the responsibility to do the teaching.

If children are not being taught by individuals who are proficient in whatever the categories or specialties of their own educational process are, then how in the world can the students then be held to bear the responsibility? And then how can the State and how can the school district sit back and develop proficiency tests that only is going to test the minimal basic skills of these students? The expectation, a term that Mr. McKenna just used, is extremely racist, as we perceive it anyway. Certainly we should be struggling and striving to get something that is very high.

No. 3, or part 2 of this testing is the standardized test. We always wondered were these students being taught the things that are supposed to be contained on that testing form? I think of the number of tests that our students are given, not only when they get in the senior high school level or junior high school level, but way down in the elementary school level. Certainly somebody would have developed some tests that were going to determine whether or not there are some inadequacies as they are being presented to those students at that early level.

As we see it in the Los Angeles Unified School District, we are losing too many of our secondary students simply because the information contained on the tests that are being given is not germane to what is actually happening with those students and in those particular individual schools.

I think in my talk about gangs, I talked about the violence process, and I am extremely concerned about the violence that is being perpetrated against black children now. It is not overt or covert; it is just there, that is all. When a group of students are permitted to matriculate through school and then come out of that school not being able to perform, then the responsibility must not fall on that student. The responsibility must fall on those persons who are supposed to be working in a cooperative form to advance the educational process and the learning process for those students in the schools.

I know of no greater violence that could be perpetrated against our students, Congressman Hawkins, than the degrading, the demoralizing and the degeneration of the moral and mental standards of those students who are matriculating in the Los Angeles Unified School District. We have to talk about the violence as it pertains to the physical aspect and to the mental aspect as well, and it is the mental part, as well, that is going lacking at this particular point in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

I must talk on point 3, the textbooks and the teacher shortages that are existent in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

When the responsibility is placed upon the children, the students, to complete a prescribed course of study at local school and then we go to the schools, we find out that there are not enough textbooks for the students that are in those particular schools. There are 500,000-some students in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and I dare say that the 123,000 or 128,000 black students do not have enough textbooks for each of the classes that they are pursuing each day, then how in the world can a child successfully matriculate through a course if he or she does not even have the textbooks.

Then the second part of it: Even if they did have the textbooks, how could they go through that course if they didn't have somebody sitting in the classroom to teach them from those textbooks? In two of our areas now, administrative areas, in Los Angeles, we know that since September in one of them there are almost 300 classes that are not filled by teachers. I know in another area, the second area, there are more than 300 teacher positions that are not filled by teachers, and there are no substitutes available for them. Then how can that responsibility fall upon those students who are matriculating in those particular schools?

I also know of another school, Congressman Hawkins, which since September, a single school, which has had 300 unmanned classroom hours since September, since school started on September 15. That is just in one school. And we have statistics to prove that they are everywhere, all over this district.

It was not a Civil Rights Act that caused the deterioration, not enough textbooks in the schools. We, from the ethnic commission, or the African American Education Commission, submitted a proposal to this board some 4 years ago talking about that particular aspect, and wrote a proposal to the board and they turned it down and gave us a report saying that *x* number of dollars are being spent for textbooks and yet we had gone in the schools and found out that over 75 percent of the kids did not have the textbooks in their particular classes. That is every class.

More importantly, I think, in this point, though, is that the lack or shortage of teachers in the black community is not something new. It is not a phenomenon that just developed. Historically in the Los Angeles Unified School District this has been a problem, and historically those persons or those levels of government in the Los Angeles School District have done nothing to talk, or to dissolve, or to ameliorate these kinds of conditions, and I am referencing the board, I am referencing the superintendent's staff, and those persons who are in the decisionmaking processes.

This lack or shortage didn't just develop, and yet nowhere have we been able to find that there is any plan that the Los Angeles Unified School District has put together that is going to try to eliminate that one particular process. We just do not have the books and no one seems to care about it except those of us who are working out here in the field all day. It is not new. It is an historical process, and I think you can review the records of the Los Angeles Unified School District to find out about it.

I heard Mr. McKenna talk about the racial or number of teachers that are in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and things of that sort, and he mentioned the office of civil rights. It is a misnomer, because people are going all around this district saying that the office of civil rights is mandating *x* number for this ratio. What they are not saying is that it is not coming from the office of civil rights in our original form; that the figures that are being used and issued by the office of civil rights are figures that the Los Angeles Unified School District has put together and sent to the office of civil rights, and then they are using the figures that were developed here in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

The teacher-to-pupil ratio has nothing whatsoever to do with the teacher-to-pupil ratio as they exist in the actual schools. The problem there is that the teachers are being given this ratio simply because of the number of people that are on the work force in the Los Angeles Unified School District. If they have 25,000 or 30,000 teachers, then that is the ratio that they are using. Those are the numbers that they are using. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the 500,000-some children that are in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

It is a big problem. We on the African American Education Commission then are going to ask that the Federal Government in its exploration in this hearing do something. Of course, I cannot absolve the Federal Government either in their responsibility, since they seem to be—I don't know what you call it, the mother or the father or the leaders, whatever they are—but they have been remiss in their responsibility to all of the citizens of these United States and those especially who are in the public schools of the United States.

You allow and permit the school districts over this Nation, and specifically the Los Angeles Unified School District, to—well, you give them funds for supplemental purposes, to supplement the existing program that is already in existence. If you were to check the Los Angeles Unified School District, you would find that there is no program, a basic program, already put together. That is the thing that bothers us.

The progressive recycling of ineffective public school, local school, administrators is another problem that exists in the Los Angeles Unified School District. You take a principal who is not able even, he or she, to do a local school program, and when he or she proves ineffective at one school, they will take that principal and move him or her 10 blocks down the street and let him continue to do that same process.

Generational genocide is the thing that we are calling it, Congressman Hawkins, and that is what has existed in the Los Angeles Unified School District. I am not talking from these things that I believe; I am talking from the research and information that we have gathered. Most of the information is coming out of the Los Angeles Unified School District statistics. I have copies of all that kind of stuff. We can support the things that we have said.

We know that—well, racism does reign supreme in Los Angeles Unified School District. Unless we can get some assistance, unless the Government stops funding Los Angeles Unified School District for the failures that they produce, and continues to fund the SEA's, the State educational agencies who grant all of the different kinds of waivers so that they can do something else, and stop actually supplanting and develop some basic programs, then the Government funds can be used for supplemental programs, and administrators like Mr. McKenna won't have to be out here hollering about the number of children who are in PWT.

I want to finally say that we totally abhor the so-called magnet program. We believe inherently that if there is so much goodness in the magnet programs that are existent in Los Angeles Unified School District, then they should not be given to just a few of the students, but all of the students who are in the Los Angeles Unified School District should be given the privilege or the right to those particular programs since they are so great.

The PWT program to which Mr. McKenna alluded, not only does it take away the students from the local schools, but it also takes all of the resources. Not only does it take all of the resources, it also decimates the school programs at the local schools when these students have gone. Mr. McKenna would be hard pressed at his school today to find five chemistry classes, or other schools that are in Los Angeles.

We lose all of that respect. We don't have—and I know this for a fact—we don't have business courses at schools. Children have to leave the local high schools to go down to Abe Freedman on the weekends so they can take business courses. I think the Government, in its responsibility to the citizens, and its application of funds—and funds are not important if the people who are in the classrooms are not able to address the issues as they relate to children, and unless we can put "public" back into public education, then we are in for great, great turmoil that is going to develop, and the revolution this time is going to enmesh or include all of the people who are involved in the educational process.

Thank you very much for your time.

[The prepared statement of Mitch Jackson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MITCH JACKSON, CHAIRPERSON, AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION COMMISSION

I. EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

A. The African American Education Commission has not been able to find any effective school programs or effective schools as the above may relate to the academic achievement of the students.

B. The paper programs exemplify goodness and effectiveness, but the statistical reports indicate a totally different aspect as reported by the school district.

C. The Staff Development Component in Los Angeles City Schools for teachers and educational aides are too few, too short, and exhibits a lack of content and methodology which leaves the classroom teacher unable to present an effective learning session for students.

D. Lack of knowledge of the instructional curriculum leads to grave misuse of instructional periods for the students.

E. The local school principals exhibition of responding to upper administrative desires precludes their administering to the needs of the student population, thus short changing students of full and comprehensive learning sessions.

II. SCHOOL BEHAVIOR AS A CRITICAL ELEMENT IN THE LEARNING PROCESS AND IN EDUCATION QUALITY

A. This "school behavior" process firstly belongs to the Board of Education. The policy setting regulations are contained in the general Administrative Guide, commonly called Board Rules. This group bears the responsibility of all programs, decisions, plannings, evaluations, etc. in the district. Some of the short comings of this Board are: information gathering, receiving and dissemination. The Board only works on data developed by the superintendent's staff. It totally dismisses "information data" gathered by other organizations, groups, etc. that are a part of the city constituency, especially in the so called minority communities. The dissemination of information to the local school communities is almost always "fragmentary" and "watered down." Local school staffs are almost never informed regarding upper administrative memoranda.

B. School behavior concerns as it relates to students is always punitive and negative. There are no "behavior" concerns that relate to principals, teachers, counselors, area administrators, superintendents, Board members that reflect any negativisms. Anything that the above groups do is always supported by each group and the students and parents must bear the responsibility. The constant white-washing of incidents perpetrated by these groups is a commonality in Los Angeles City Schools in the ethnic minority areas.

The attitudes and expectations of principals and teachers have always been of great concern to our students and parents. The constant talking down to our students has prevailed for years and classroom teachers and non-classroom personnel constantly tell our students, who have been labeled disadvantaged, to accept your "C" grade and don't aspire to get an "A" or "B"; lack of leadership of the local school principals is of paramount concern. Here I am referencing principals who don't have the ability to administer a local school program. The most blatant behavior in this area is the school district's re-cycling of ineffective principals; when they prove unable to positively function at one school, the district will move that person from one school and assign them to another school that is only 8 or 10 blocks away and continue to practice that same ineffectiveness.

III. INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS FOR POOR CHILDREN

We have been unable to locate instructionally effective schools in the South Central and East Los Angeles areas. Let us reference just some of the inadequacies that prevail in our South Central and East Los Angeles local schools: Textbooks—our school district does not have enough textbooks for the number of students who are enrolled in Los Angeles City Schools. At this date, November 6, 1981, there are students in the South Central and East Los Angeles areas who started to school in September and don't have but one (1) textbook. How could they be expected to progress through a course when there aren't textbooks to be utilized? The content in most textbooks that are in use is racist, demeaning and devoid of real truth. The lack of the number and the content of the few that are in the schools are only just two of the problems. The holding back of students in their classes is another of the inadequacies that is prevalent. Students with great abilities and who can move at an accelerated pace are held back by teachers so they may develop that third level of student. They are not allowed to grow at the rate of their abilities.

The tracking of students into certain remedial groups within their classes and the placing of these students into the slow learning groups that they never leave all the way through school is another of the inadequacies present in our geographic areas. Our children are tracked into the most degrading categories, i.e., EH, EMR, TRM—LD, and placed there without parent consent.

The utilization of the many different reading and math programs in our schools has a very bad effect on our students and parents. The high transiency rate of the students and the presence of the many programs in reading and math does not allow for any continuity in learning. When the child has to go with his or her parents to another school attendance area, he or she must also contend with another program and thus start from square one (1) again.

Other facts with which we must deal is the high teacher transiency rate, teacher absenteeism, shortage of permanent teachers and no substitute teachers. Some of our children have already had as many as six or seven teachers since September 15 of this year. In two of our Administrative Areas, there are approximately 400-500 teacher shortages.

For the above mentioned reasons and many more, we have been unable to find instructionally effective schools in Los Angeles.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN FACILITATING QUALITY EDUCATION AND SCHOOL SUCCESS

It is with remorse that we view the Federal government's past role in facilitating quality education and school success. In reviewing the government's past role as a facilitator, we must condemn the general regulations that has been developed. We must first refer to the specially funded programs, commonly called Compensatory Education. PL 89-10 once had as a requirement, one month's growth for students for one month's instruction. Although it was not enough, it at least had some accountability to it. The process degenerated so much that it has allowed the S.E.A.'s to permit the L.E.A.'s to expect only five months growth for nine months instruction. The comparability reports asked for by the Federal government in the past only dealt with fund expenditures by the S.E.A.'s and L.E.A.'s.

The government has also been rewarding the S.E.A.'s and L.E.A.'s for the "failures" they reported in their evaluations. It has allowed the S.E.A.'s to utilize a combination of fund sources related to the individual student and set the service amount to the student at an extremely low level. The supplementing rather than supplanting clause has been only words and nothing else. We believe the government should facilitate the total extra fund resources for students by having constant monitoring of S.E.A.'s and L.E.A.'s; that accountability of both agencies must be a "fact" rather than a report: that the amount of extra resources should be utilized without a low maximum per student ratio; that there must be comparability in areas other than fund expenditures, i.e., pupil growth, measurable personnel performance, administrative proficiency; that the government should eradicate the promiscuous use of "waivers" and that a greater amount of success for students must be the rule rather than the exception. Finally, the Federal government must intercede where the collective bargaining of teacher organizations extracts from the resources that are designated for students.

In conclusion, the aforementioned issues are indicative of the areas to be covered during my testimony before your subcommittee. At that time I will be prepared to provide in greater detail the necessary information concerning the educational process in Los Angeles City Schools.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

I wish to commend all three witnesses for their very excellent testimony. You have thrown out a lot of challenges and I am sure there are a lot of questions that can be addressed to the problems that you have raised.

Mr. Jackson, let me make sure what the Los Angeles Unified School District African American Education Commission is. Is this a creature of the unified school district, and if not, what is it?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir. It is a creature of the board of education. It is mandated or put together on a board rule that is numbered 1995, and we are a subsidiary to the board of education. We are to go out and monitor programs, get information, the concerns of the black community.

Mr. HAWKINS. And your members are named by the board of education?

Mr. JACKSON. No, they are not.

Mr. HAWKINS. How are they selected?

Mr. JACKSON. We hold them at a public election in the community.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see. They are publicly elected on a community basis.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see. Thank you. I just think we need that background when we address the questions.

Mrs. Haynes, are you currently employed in the school system?

Ms. HAYNES. No, I am not. I am retired from Los Angeles Unified School District June 30, 1980. I am now serving as the executive secretary of the Council of Black Administrators.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see. I just wanted to know the perspective from which we address the questions. You are, then, a retired principal, Mr. McKenna is an active principal, a very active one, and Mr. Jackson is a democratically elected—small "d"—community elected representative of a commission that serves in an advisory capacity to the unified school district.

Mr. JACKSON. And I am not an employee of the school district.

Mr. HAWKINS. And you are not an employee of the school district.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. That is rather obvious, Mr. Jackson.

Let me first yield to my colleague here for the questions.

Mr. Kildee, of Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I really appreciate your testimony. I tell people in real life I was a teacher. I still feel I am a teacher, and I just love to hear people talk about how education can be improved. It has been a very helpful panel today.

Let me ask just a few questions. We have been trying to ask in the hearings we had in Washington and now out here, when we do find an effective school, how can we replicate that? Several of you referred to that replication. What I can gather from what you have been saying here is that it is not primarily so much process or even tools, it is people—the principal, the staff, even the parents.

Is there a Federal role that can be played in encouraging that concept of utilizing people in the best possible way to make these schools more effective?

Mr. McKenna. Well, the microphone is in my face, and I have never been known to move a microphone when it is in my face.

In respect to that, I think the Federal Government's role can be, by holding the local schools accountable for those things which they spend their moneys on. If a person is held accountable, they have a way of finding people to do the jobs for which they will be held accountable. You can't clone people; not yet we can't. The Federal Government's role is, if you hold a local school district accountable, really accountable, not simply what they tell you they have done, really look at it, really have someone there watching on a daily basis, monitoring and auditing, you will then find them being more receptive to putting in the people to make those programs work.

One of the things that I have always advocated is the team approach to administration of a school. Let me give you a typical example. I am a brandnew principal. I had never been a principal in my life, and I was assigned to Washington High, which is like throwing a rabbit in a briar patch, but to some people it would be their death knell, because the school was fraught with problems that had been coming to them for years.

But they take a brandnew principal, with no experience, and give that person Washington High. I could have been incompetent, and maybe I am in some people's eyes, but that is what I was given. I walked in there all alone. No team came with me. I had to move out other people who were incompetent and work on my own. I did not bring with me my own assistant principals. I have no power in that, determining who my support staff is. I am simply assigned to a school as an individual, and I am stuck with what is there. When I say stuck, we are talking about the individuals.

The Federal Government's role is simply, I think, to be more active in learning what goes on in a school. How many times, other than perhaps in compensatory education programs, do teams of Federal monitors come through schools and actually look at what they are doing? And not once a year, when you can put on the best possible face. You need to ask some hard questions.

I think the harder your questions are and the higher your expectations, the greater will be the response from the local school district.

Mr. Kildee. In Washington High, are there any particular Federal programs that have been especially effective or helpful to you in bringing about some of the changes in the school?

Mr. McKenna. Interestingly enough, Washington High has no Federal programs.

Mr. **Kildee**. None at all.

Mr. **McKenna**. We are the only inner-city school that qualifies for title I funds that does not receive it because we are too low on the priority. The money runs out before it gets to us. So Washington High receives no compensatory educational funds.

Mr. **Kildee**. If more money were appropriated and, therefore, you weren't off the scale when the money ran out, do you think that title I funds could be used in an effective way to enhance what you are already doing?

Mr. **McKenna**. If you asked me how I wanted to use the money, and not tell me how to use the money; but then, again, I wouldn't say to do that with every principal. So maybe someone needs to sit down and come up with guidelines that the community feels will be effective. You can pump title I moneys into schools, just like with poverty programs, and it will all get drained off by the bureaucracy before it gets to the child. A lot of conventions will be held, a lot of drinks will be toasted, and a whole lot of things will happen before it gets to the child.

Compensatory education is a potentially beneficial thing. In its actuality, it sometimes remediates us to death. The expectation is that all we need is to be remediated. We get Federal funds for teaching youngsters math and English, but as long as you keep them nonreading, you keep them needing title I funds. And if, in fact, you show improvement, the title I funds are cut back.

Mr. **Kildee**. Do any of the others want to comment?

Mr. **McKenna**. They both do, I guess.

Mr. **Kildee**. All right, I will moderate.

Ms. **Haynes**. When I went to Grape in 1969, there were title III Federal funds at the school, and they were a total obstacle and roadblock to the program. After I had been there for one semester—and I really won't have time to go into why, but it was supposed to have been an innovative program that somebody else innovated and imposed on the school, and that is not innovative.

It was divisive because it covered kindergarten through the first grade when I first arrived. Then it was going to progress into the second grade and it wasn't ever going to get any higher than the third grade.

The first semester I was there, we were monitored and then title I funds came that next semester, because I went in during the spring term. I can't remember, but we got just lots of money and we were frustrated because everybody at the school, in trying to involve people in planning for the budget, everybody in the school envisioned title I funds meaning to pull people out of the classroom, and everybody who had never taught a day in their lives there became qualified to come out of the classroom.

We really had a very frustrating fury that first year, but we got ourselves together and we got involved in the team approach. So that next year we really had some plans that we had developed by working together all year long. Those funds became our lifeblood. Without them, we could not have done the kinds of things that we did with programing at Grape Street.

Mr. **Jackson**. I don't want you to omit me, although I am the smallest one up here.

You did ask what role the Government could play, and I want to address it in that manner. It would be somewhat of a criticism, but also a constructive criticism, I hope, and if you don't view it like that, that is fine. It is your privilege. I don't care.

What really the Government has been doing in the past and what they should stop doing is that all of the funds that they allocate to the State education agencies, who then allocates the money to the local education agencies, the only process that the Government wants to hear is a comparability report. That comparability report is only in a financial process.

The Government, whatever it is, whether it is compensatory education or any other general funds moneys, they are going to have to expect more for the moneys that they are allocating, and they are going to have to hold the State education agencies responsible not only for the fiscal responsibilities, but the comparability process and the reports that are going to be made are going to have to encompass student performance, efficiency and proficiency of the persons who are utilizing and spending the moneys. The fiscal responsibilities and the comparability is going to have to be sure that it is not just the LEA's and the SEA's who are making the decisions on how the programs are put together, but you are going to have to put into it where the parents, the community people, are going to have to have some decisionmaking powers or you are going to continue to get nothing for your money for the reports.

Mr. KILDEE. Just one final question, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, but will you yield at that point?

Mr. KILDEE. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. If this has been true in the past, then it would seem to me the problem would be even greater under the concept of returning control to the local agencies, the local school districts, or block granting moneys without any particular standards or criteria or any controls.

Would you agree that that threat is even greater?

Mr. JACKSON. I would agree.

Mr. HAWKINS. What you seem to be saying is that money should not be given without at least some control over what happens to the money. What is happening—and this gets back to the Federal responsibility, I think, that Mr. McKenna indicated, or perhaps you did in your remarks—is that there will be less possibility of those of us at the Federal level having any say-so.

Mr. JACKSON. And there would be less possibility of those of us who are in the community having any say-so. If you give it in a block grant form, we are wiped out completely.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is a corollary to that. Under the legislation that was passed starting in September 1982, the parental advisory councils for title I programs were eliminated.

Could you comment on the role of the advisory councils?

Ms. HAYNES. I could never have existed at Grape without the support of the parents; no way. They initially came in and organized ministers, legislators, just parents in general, and helped to minimize the vandalism. They cut it out completely within the first year that I was there.

The first thing we did with our title I moneys was to transfer the education aide 3's who were unrestricted there for the title III program. We transferred them and found approporiate placement for them and employed the parents in our community as education aides.

I ran into big trouble. Let me just tell this, because as soon as they got employed, we got a termination notice 3 months after they were employed, that they were to be terminated at the end of 6 months. I guess I worried everybody down there at that board of education until they changed some legislation in Sacramento in order for me to keep those parents in that school. It is most important that that component remain in the program. It was for me.

Mr. McKENNA. My response will be brief.

I think that my attitude as a principal, about parents, is different, if not totally in opposition to most administrators' point of view. I will be very candid about that. I welcome parents in the school. I cannot survive without them because I perceive my role as being one that answers and is responsive to the community. All administrators do not feel that way. As a matter of fact, most of them do not. They are very protective about who is in charge here.

We hear that all the time. Who is going to really run the schools. There is a great fear on the part of administrators that parents will tell them what to do, and they feel that their degrees and their titles and their educational expertise permits them to tune parents out and say, "I will welcome you at back to school night. I will welcome you at open house. But other than that, don't call me; I will call you."

That is a pervasive attitude in this district, which I don't think is unique to most major urban situations, where parents really don't have a lot of involvement, and only the strongest ones of them, and the most vocal ones, are the ones who can get any say-so in at all. So unless parents are willing to be very aggressive and assertive, the school does not, in fact, have a vehicle for welcoming them with open arms.

There are papers written about what you are supposed to do, but nobody says you are unsuccessful as a principal if you don't do that. One of the lowest expectations on the totem pole is how many parents are involved in the school. Is it quiet? Are they rioting? Every now and then they will ask about test scores. But they don't expect you to remain in a school as a principal more than 4 or 5 years anyway, and they look for another promotion, or lateral moves, and sometimes I think the Peter Principle is alive and well and living in Los Angeles.

Mr. JACKSON. I would have to say that one of the biggest mistakes that the Federal Government has made in that law that you passed is where it is going to remove the local parent councils. I want you to understand that I did not say the local parent advisory councils. That is the first and biggest mistake that you have ever made, in mandating a parent advisory council.

We who have the children, who support the children, who support the schools, have the least to say about what is happening to our children. Therefore, a particular kind of committee developed at the local school level is going to have to be envisioned and put together so that the decisionmaking process, where parents are concerned about their children, is going to have to be a decisionmaking thing rather than an advice-giving thing.

If you continue to put it off in the advisory capacity, then you are not doing the parents any good, you are not doing the schools any good, and you are not doing the Federal Government any good. You are still going to get comparability reports that are not telling you anything. You must put it back, if you haven't already, and you must give the parents some decisionmaking powers in that process; otherwise, consternation is going to continue to reign supreme.

Mr. KILDEE. Just one more question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. KILDEE. This has been very helpful to me

Mr. HAWKINS. There is no limit, so go ahead.

Mr. KILDEE. We have a 5-minute rule back in Washington.

Mr. HAWKINS. Which you may exceed with grace.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you.

Mr. McKenna, you referred to the zero based hiring, I think, in the ninth grade, when you took on the ninth grade in your high school. Were you able to do that within the citywide teacher contract? Was there any problem there?

Mr. McKENNA. No. You could not do zero based hiring in the city. No, the union would not permit that. I guess unions are for that purpose, to protect the people who pay dues to the unions. Since children have no union, they have no say-so in that. They guarantee teachers who have seniority rights. So it did not work around the city. It only worked in those three schools for which we wrote this proposal. Washington High was just one of those schools.

Because we got an influx of ninth graders, 400 additional youngsters, I had to hire additional teachers. Then some teachers left because they were either frustrated with what I was asking them to do—and I drove some of them out; I will be honest about it—because of my expectations, and so at Washington High this year I have hired physically 55 brandnew teachers at the school, and the school has 117 bodies on it as I speak now, 118 when I get back.

Mr. KILDEE. But the hiring of those teachers on a zero base for the ninth grade was not prohibited by the contract?

Mr. McKENNA. No, it didn't prevent me from doing that because I had to hire them anyway. When I say zero base, I am talking about—you see, it came from the concept of this: Because the inner-city schools were hard to staff, teachers were saying they didn't want to work in those schools. White teachers were saying this, they didn't want to work in inner-city schools. They offered the teachers a salary increment to work in those schools. They would get paid additional money. Some people called it combat pay.

For that money they are supposed to do additional duties. Most principals don't ask those teachers to do anything but what they were doing originally. I made them do some additional things. They couldn't stand it. So the union and I had to fight, and I don't apologize for that. I expect if I make changes, somebody is going to try to stop me. Since I know who it is, I have no problem, as long as they don't come up from behind me. As long as they are in front of me, that is fine. I know who it is.

Consequently, in order to make those changes, it was necessary to hold people's feet to the fire. The union does not want a zero based situation. Now, they still have increments to work in inner-city schools. Right now the office of civil rights mandate is not being applied because they finally found out that even with the increment, we still cannot get white people who want to work in inner-city black schools. That is a fact. It still exists and will continue to be a fact.

If you say it is anything other than racism, we could argue. I don't care what else you want to call it, that is what it is. Because of that, we are willing to pay for people. When we started talking about the increment, we said, "If you are going to get an increment, let us start with a zero base hiring." The union fought that. So everyone who was there the year before was grandfathered in, whether they could do the job or not. They were just given more money to stay where they were, stay put.

The original concept was to have zero based hiring; that everybody who was going to work in an inner-city school where the increment was given, the principal and the community were supposed to be able to interview them from scratch. So the mere fact that you had been there for 50 years did not give you carte blanche to remain. But the union fought it and it was kicked out. So they were grandfathered in.

So the only way you get a zero based situation right now is with some special program, if you turn the school into a magnet school, if you turn it into a preparatory school, or you have the addition of a whole new grade level. That gives you, in effect, the reality of zero based hiring. But that is the premise upon which I began to operate, knowing that only certain people can make certain programs work. You cannot replicate things on paper that will automatically work in other situations.

I do believe that staff development is possible. Ms. Haynes is a strong proponent of upgrading teachers, that certain people who are ineffective can be made effective. I take issue with Ms. Haynes on some of that. We are good friends and we argue about that all the time. I think that sow's ears stay sow's ears. She believes that some of them can be turned into a silk purse. I think that some of them can be saved, but most of them cannot.

I have a frustration with trying to tolerate mediocrity in teachers, and I will not institutionalize mediocrity. You see, I don't want you to get the feeling, too, that my perception of education is one of a very liberal point of view. I can be very conservative on many issues. I am not permissive at all with children. I believe in them having the right to be children, but I also believe that I have the right to restrict them to certain kinds of activities.

For example, at Washington High we have some dress standards for students that no other school may have, and I don't care. I don't ask. No young man can wear an earring on campus. No one can wear curlers in their hair to come to school. They can't bring radios to school. There are certain other things they cannot do. I will not permit it.

Now, the board of education says you can't tell children what to wear. I do, and I don't think anyone is going to run me out of Washington High School because I am doing that. No parent has yet said to me, "I demand my child be able to wear pink and green rollers to school." I say no. If it is pouring down rain, OK; otherwise, no.

So we have some conservative values and we also have some, I think, humanistic values. I am not one to believe that additional security agents on campus is what will lower the level of violence and raise the level of security and safety on the campus. You can put a hundred security agents on a campus and it won't change it. It won't change a thing. You have to teach children to love each other. You have to teach children to not want to be violent. You can't teach them self-defense as a means of protecting themselves. You have to teach them defenses of the heart, of the spirit, of the soul, so that there is no need to hate and no need to take advantage of people.

But we don't do that. There is no curriculum that teaches love. There is no love I, love II; there is no prerequisite for taking chemistry. You can build a bomb. If you don't know what to do with it, everybody is in trouble. We don't teach values in the school any longer. We really don't. There is no course that says teach values. Now whose values? That may be an issue. But just plain humanistic values. The board of education does not allow us to do that. They restrict us to 150 credits at the high school level. You must have 150 credits in order to graduate, and there is very little flexibility in that, so much of this, so much of that, so much of the other, so you try to teach values internally.

I have tried to teach values in assemblies. Some of my teachers write anonymous letters and say I am preaching racism and hatred. I kept a young man in an assembly one day and a young woman the other day, and they said that was sexist. I am sure the young woman wouldn't have been interested in what I was saying to those young men, and those young men certainly wouldn't have been interested in what was said to the young ladies, and I locked myself out of that assembly.

But we try to teach values in there. We talk about manhood. We talk about being fathers. We talk about power, economic base, all kinds of things that they don't get anywhere else. Kids need to be told what it is like to be a father. Some of them don't have a father. They don't know what a father is supposed to do. They don't know fathers change diapers. They don't know fathers walk their kids in the park. They think it is cool to make babies and leave them, because that is the only image they have. Somebody has got to tell them something some time. I choose to do that. If I am wrong, it will catch up with me sooner or later, but I don't mind.

Ms. HAYNES. In my defense, George and I are the best of friends, and we argue this point all the time.

I do not believe all teachers can be saved. When I went to Grape, more teachers transferred out than stayed in during that first year. Every year the first 2 years I was there I had an almost brandnew staff. But as new people came in, I was able to become selective, and those people who agreed to stay, I do believe that they could be saved, and I do believe in staff development.

I did chronicle my experiences at Grape, and I am going to give Congressman Dale Kildee a copy of this "Good News on Grape" because Congressman Hawkins already has a copy. "Good News on Grape Street—The Transformation of a Ghetto School." It will answer a lot of the questions.

Mr. **JACKSON**. I would like for you to hear all of these things that these people who are working in the schools are saying, and I agree with some of them and some of them I don't. Staff development is one of the elements that is a critical issue with those of us who are members of the African American Education Commission.

Staff development in Los Angeles Unified School District is supposedly to increase the potential for the teaching proficiency within the classroom, to enhance the teacher and the teacher aides so that they might work together to see to it that children are better learners and that their performance ratios grow.

In the Los Angeles City School District there are too few staff development sessions being held. The content of the staff development sessions is nil, nothing, completely nothing, and if it does not deal with enlarging and causing the student to learn more or to be exposed to more, and to cause the teacher in the classroom and the administrator at the school to see to it that the teacher in the classroom is providing that excellent educational opportunity for the child, then the staff development is not working.

When staff development is going to be done only by Los Angeles Unified School District and those persons who deal with the district on a contractual basis, then staff development is not going to do it. I am with George. I just don't believe too many of them can be saved in that process.

Ms. **HAYNES**. Just one thing. I just have to do this. I am not talking about Los Angeles Unified School District staff development. I am talking about the staff development that was developed and implemented at Grape Street School by the staff there. And to me, that is a big difference.

Mr. **JACKSON**. We only have 500-some schools in this district, so more, then, fine.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. May I indicate that, Mr. McKenna, it is now 3:15. If you must be excused, let us excuse you at this time.

Mr. **MCKENNA**. Unless you have another question. I can wait a few minutes.

Mr. **KILDEE**. I am through. I just want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this tremendous panel together. I think it has been extremely helpful to this committee.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Mr. Smith, I think, is to be credited. I don't mind getting all the credit I can in my own district, but I think Mr. Smith was responsible.

Mr. **KILDEE**. It has been very good. I really appreciate your testimony.

Mr. **JACKSON**. Before you send us away and somebody else comes in, I would like to ask——

Mr. **HAWKINS**. You are not being sent away at this point.

Mr. **JACKSON**. OK, thank you very much. But before I do, I have a question to ask you.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. I yield to Ms. Vance for whatever she needs some time for.

Ms. **VANCE**. Thank you. I would just like to make a comment.

I was interested, as this morning's discussion proceeded to learn of the misinterpretation of the law with regard to the involvement of parents under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. I do not know if all of you were here this morning, but I am representing the Republican members of the subcommittee, who were unable to attend today. One thing I am quite certain Representative Ashbrook would like to communicate, both as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor and also the author of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, is what he intended in terms of parents' involvement under both chapter I and chapter II of ECIA.

FROM THE FLOOR. It is in black and white, what you intended.

Ms. VANCE. Mr. Ashbrook's purpose in leaving out the mandatory requirement on parent advisory councils was to insure LEA's would not be dictated to by Washington as to how parents should be involved. Hopefully, there will be more cooperation with schools like you have, Mr. McKenna, that will allow parents to become involved in the process in a meaningful way at the local level.

Mr. HAWKINS. We have too many witnesses. We will be very glad to swear in any of the witnesses who would like to present a few points and be identified in the record later, but Ms. Vance was explaining the intent of the author of the block grant proposal, and if it isn't operating as he intended, she was just trying to explain that. Let us get that. We will give others an opportunity to make their comments.

Go ahead, Ms. Vance.

Ms. VANCE. That is really all I had to say.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. KILDEE. I am through, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have only a few questions. I think Mr. Kildee had asked most of mine, and I think the witnesses have been extremely articulate and clear in their statements. They have left no room for doubt, I think, in what has been expressed. Just a few points of clarification.

Mr. McKenna, you emphasized the role of parents in the classroom. I think you made a very good case for that. You also indicated that in disadvantaged schools, or so-called schools of disadvantaged students, that parents could not afford to serve in such roles without some compensation.

Were you suggesting that it would be a very wise investment to have such parents in the classroom and that in terms of compensation that if this could be a program among those eligible for Federal funding, that it would be well spent, because it seems to me this is something which is concrete, it is something which I think had been envisioned under the CETA program. Call it CETA or anything else, regardless of what it is called.

Would you think that in terms of education that it would be a cost effective and wise investment to provide some compensation for parents from the neighborhoods to be selected in the schoolrooms?

Mr. McKENNA. Yes, I do, Congressman. I specifically feel that the parents of the youngsters who are currently in attendance at the school, if they are working or if they are in any way connected with anything where they are physically capable of coming to the school, that compensation in kind to either their employer or to them for attending on a regular basis should be given, because I think that a youngster who knows that his or her parent is on the campus has a totally different attitude about what school is all about in conjunction with the home, and what the values are that he has in the home and what the parents are trying to reinforce from the school.

Many parents believe that if they send their child to school, that is enough; the school will take care of them. Put them in the hands of the church, put them in the hands of the school, and somebody will save them. That is not enough. They have to be there, but they can't be there because they are trying to make a buck. I think that most employers, if they could really be encouraged by the political climate and political leaders to give release time to parents, if they just gave them half a day a month, just that much, and we knew who was coming on what day, we could organize things for those parents to do, places for them to be, the kids would see them on campus, and the atmosphere would completely change. It changes every time parents get to a school.

But we usually wait for crises to do it. You let somebody get killed on a school campus, parents will turn out like crazy, and for 2 or 3 weeks the atmosphere will calm down. But it is only in a crisis.

To answer your question, yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have not had an opportunity to visit George Wshington High School for the simple reason that it is not in my district, and I pretty well confine myself to the schools in my district. Under reapportionment, it is being added, so you probably will have a visit from me very soon. But that is a prelude to the question.

I have noticed in schools that I have visited a very serious discipline problem. I have noticed the lack of security. I have seen what I would call policemen on the campus, and so forth. You have painted what seems to be a different picture at your particular school. In terms of security, let us say, would you say you have—and may I also indicate that I am not talking altogether about the students in the particular school. I have noticed outside groups coming into the schoolyard, which seems to pose a more serious problem. I don't know whether you have the same problem at George Washington High, but if you do or don't have it, could you explain to us in what way, then, can this problem be reached, especially that part of the problem which is imposed on the school by outsiders coming onto the campus?

Mr. MCKENNA. Outsiders do cause some problems in terms of the campus. Most of the problems, I think, that come to a school come from people who are not students at the school. The drug traffic comes from the outside. It comes into the inside, but it starts with the outside. Whatever comes on a campus is brought from the outside, either legally or illegally.

But what I think can cure much of that on the school campus is the presence of the community on the campus in a paid capacity to help police their own schools, and if I use the word "police," I don't mean security agents with guns. They don't prevent anything. Their whole mindset is totally different. You will not be able to get security agents to stand at the front door every day, as a parent would do, and in a gracious, humanistic way greet the parents and welcome them to the school, and that kind of thing. Security agents won't do that, and that is not what they are supposed to do. They are supposed to make arrests, and things like that.

But that is after the fact. I don't want kids arrested. I prefer them not to do what they get arrested for. I would prefer that they didn't have dope. But they don't make dope. They don't grow it. They buy it from the professionals on the street. That is a police responsibility. And it is very interesting to note that PCP and those kinds of things that are cooked in garages where they blow up, that isn't done in Beverly Hills. They do cocaine in Beverly Hills. In the black community it is the destructive, mind-destroying kinds of things that just throws your brain cells away. I am not advocating that cocaine is easier on your brain, it is all detrimental; but there is a different kind of permissiveness that occurs in the black community from the police point of view.

But I am saying that we do need more parents on campus, and we need to fund these things that will permit parents to become involved, unless we are afraid that parents will make the school change. If that is the case, then maybe everything we have been doing all along was wrong. Heaven forbid that we would ever admit that.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Jackson, during your remarks, you made reference to the scarcity of textbooks, a teacher shortage in terms of classrooms without teachers, or unmanned classrooms I think is the way you phrased it. Are such data included in the remarks that you have filed with the committee? The statement does include clarification of those?

Mr. JACKSON. No, the statement doesn't include the clarification.

Mr. HAWKINS. Are you actually suggesting that in the Los Angeles Unified School District that there is an absence of textbooks in some of the classes?

Mr. JACKSON. I am. I am not suggesting it; it is a part of the record.

Mr. HAWKINS. I appreciate the assistance from the audience, but we will give you an opportunity. I may not be agreeing or disagreeing. I am trying to clarify the statements for the record, because we want the record to reflect the entirety of what is being said.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you allow me to clarify it?

Mr. HAWKINS. Certainly, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. The absence of textbooks and things I do not have with me here, but it is a part of the court records and all of that that came through the so-called desegregation or integration process. During that whole process, an order came from one of the judges asking the Los Angeles Unified School District to make a survey of the books that are missing or that are in the school district, and then come up with it.

So the court demanded the record, the process was performed by the Los Angeles Unified School District, and I can very easily obtain that and give it to you. So it is not something that I dreamed up.

Mr. **Hawkins**. All we need is the citation as to the sources of the remark so that it can be verified and action taken at least to do something about it.

Mr. **Jackson**. I can provide that. No problem. I can provide that.

Mr. **Hawkins**. We will certainly appreciate that.

[Information referred to above, requested by subcommittee and never received.]

Mr. **Hawkins**. May I thank the three witnesses. You have been excellent and very forthright. I think the fact that you bring a lot of experience to the statements that you have presented to the committee is very helpful. There are many challenges that you have made, and I think we have benefited tremendously by your statements this afternoon.

I would like to commend each of you for the very courageous—I hate to say that it takes courage sometimes—but for the very courageous positions that you have taken before this committee. You have certainly given us a tremendous lift, I think, in terms of faith in what is being done by dedicated individuals. So we certainly commend you.

Mr. **Jackson**. You said you were going to let me ask a question.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Yes, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. **Jackson**. What will this committee do once it leaves this hearing? What is the intent of the committee, I think I would like to know?

Mr. **Hawkins**. The committee is in the process of taking testimony on effective schools and effective practices within the schools. The committee will make its recommendations to the full Committee on Education and Labor, which is chaired by Mr. Perkins, who was here this morning. It is expected that what is learned from this series of hearings across the country, that these ideas once refined and agreed to by a majority of the members of the committee, will be incorporated in legislation.

We obviously anticipate that some legislation will be introduced and that these ideas will be incorporated in that. In addition to that, it is hoped that, through public discussions of the various issues involved, that recommendations can be made through the chairman of the committee to the Department of Education, if it is continued, or to its successor, that we will, through public hearings, be able to influence decisions across the country.

You realize, of course, that in the field of education there is a philosophy that it should be left to the people at the local level and that we should not be interfering in the process at the Federal level. Whether that is controversial or not, obviously there are some of us who do interfere to some extent, if you may call it interference.

Mr. **Jackson**. Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Mr. Kildee may want to give a further answer.

Mr. **Jackson**. I don't think he wants to talk to me.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Mr. Jackson, very much.

Mr. **Jackson**. Thank you all for letting me come and talk to you. I hope you do something after you leave.

Mr. **Kildee**. You pay our salaries.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you.

The final panel of witnesses on the schedule will consist of Ms. Gloria Searls, Executive Director of the International Children's School; Mr. Raul Arreola, Executive Director of the Los Angeles Unified School District Mexican-American Education Commission; Ms. Sophia Esparza, president, Parents Involved in Community Action; and Ms. Vicky Verches, president, East Los Angeles Mexican-American Educators Association.

Ms. Verches has had to cancel out.

What about the others? Ms. Searls and Ms. Esparza?

Ms. **Esparza**. I am Sophia Esparza. E-s-p-a-r-z-a. Sometimes they misspell it.

Mr. **Hawkins**. It is spelled correctly. I mispronounced it.

Ms. **Esparza**. Oh. Well, we will have to make you bilingual.

Mr. **Hawkins**. You seem to be a good teacher, all right.

I have two additional witnesses, Bob Frances, and Mr. Ron Rodriguez. You may be seated now.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF GLORIA SEARLS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S SCHOOL

Ms. **Searls**. I am Gloria Searls, from International Children's School.

This school is particularly unique because it was created by parents requesting it. Back in 1968—I will go back to 1966—I had left Los Angeles Unified School District to start a preschool International Children's Center. I had done this with 22 years in public school education and university education teaching behind me. I had some very strong ideas about what young children could do if given opportunities to do it.

So I created the International Children's Center. This school became very, very successful as a preschool. The parents came to me requesting first grade, second grade, and I responded by referring them to other schools, private schools. When they came back not being able to get their children into the private schools, it was then that I told them, with your help, and if you will commit yourself to helping, we will start this school.

It took from 1968 until 1975 to build quite a fantastic school which houses some 300 children, classrooms, sciences, art, orchestra, gymnastics, dramatics, darkroom, all sorts of things. The most unique thing about it is that it is in the inner city and it is the kind of thing that children of the advantaged are exposed to, but these are children from poor families who are able to attend this school.

The other part about it is the fact that among our children we are now getting the feedback after all these years what they are doing in college. I think one of the most glowing things that I could say is about one of our students who is 15 years old, a sophomore at UCLA, and a Phi Beta Kappa candidate. We have students at the University of Washington, Fiske University, UCLA, Howard University, Brandeis University, University of Massachusetts, most on scholarships.

When parents seek a school such as this, they are looking to answer a need, and the need that we had, or rather, the need that we answered is that our school opens at 6:30 a.m. in the morning and it does not close until 6 p.m. in the evening. So the parents bring their children there and go on to work. We feel in one way we have answered the "key-around-the-neck child" from first grade through ninth grade, because not only are they involved in academic subjects, they are involved in afterschool subjects of the extended learning subjects, the orchestra, the drama, the science projects, the things that I have mentioned.

The one thing that I have found that is a very prevailing thing in education now is that a new family has emerged in our society, and people keep referring to the children, the 15-year-olds are doing this, and the 12-year-olds are doing that. They do not look at the fact that throughout our country we have an enormous percentage of single parents. It is among the wealthy and it is among the not wealthy. The children of poor parents are the minority parents who are found in that particular status. They are still feeling 1935 and 1940 reactions to family.

Quite often you will hear a teacher talk about a family, a mother, a father and a child. What we have had to do was teach our children a mother and a child is a family, a father and a child is a family, a grandmother and a child is a family. We need to educate these people to this. I feel that the schools that are public and that are out there for the children, because we are very unique, we are one small, private school in this setup, but the public school should also address that.

You can appeal to dignity in the children, you can appeal to dignity in their parents, if you give them the respect and dignity that they deserve. This is not being done that much in our present educational philosophies and approaches. We still have the parent who is afraid to go to the school because quite often the principal or the teacher will refer to "Your child has no father," or to the father, "Where is the mother," and we have got to deal with the fact that it is so many of them.

Within our own school we have a large percentage of children with parents, two parents together, but a larger percentage of children with two parents who are not together. We must build dignity and an appreciation and an acceptance of that.

Our school facility is very unique. We built the school without halls, without bells. We created a beautiful, beautiful art classroom without a ceiling. It can rain and children can still go right out and have art. We search to enjoy what California can give to us, the beautiful sunshine and what not.

The school facility is bright and cheerful. It is built around a plaza. The children plant flowers, there is a stage, sunken plaza, grounds for them to play in and also to work in. It is not a huge expanse of pavement that you so much see in the inner city for the poor children but you do not see it in other communities.

Approximately once a year the staff, certain members of my staff, will go with me to visit schools. Last year we visited four high schools and junior high schools. One of them was Crenshaw High. It was very barricaded, and the children had very little to do. They did a lot of sitting around, talking, and no doubt thinking of mischief because there was very little to challenge them.

We went to another school that I remember 20 years ago, Vernon, Mount Vernon, that had been thought of as a school that was in a lot of trouble. Today it is a very fabulous school. The people working there, the principals, the teachers, have really made it into an alive, wonderful place for youngsters.

We went to a school that 20 years ago had been considered one of the fine, fine schools, Pasteur, where in a science room they had put a pool table and the boys had their hats on backward shooting pool, and on one wall they were allowing them to express themselves, and they were drawing a very horrible mural, and it was very chaotic.

Then we went to Beverly Hills High School. I have never in my life seen anything quite like it, not even at many colleges. They have their own communications center, their own television studies, everything that you could think of.

I think the Federal Government should look at the fact that schools should be equal for all children, whether they are Indian children, immigrant children, black children, or advantaged children, because the moneys that are spent at Beverly Hills, a great deal of it, I am sure, is the same kind of tax money that is spent at Crenshaw High School.

So I merely want to say one or two things before I stop. The schools must be places for our children to want to learn in. There has been a tremendous change in education and the role that it must play for children. I think teachers must be helped to teach children. They, themselves, must be given assistance. They must move from the textbook and go more into the textbook as well as to teach children about what is currently happening in the world, because children need to know about the world. This is not a place any more in our country where children are born in a community, grow up in a community, marry in that community and die in that community.

These children that we are working with, we are preparing them for the 21st century, and they know that they are going to be going to Africa and Europe and other places. So the teacher's role today must be one to help them understand that world, to know what OPEC is about, and how it is going to change so many things. In our school during the OPEC crisis, even our first graders were involved in a study of the Far East and the OPEC countries.

I think we should realize that for poor children there is a gap, there is a tremendous gap, in education, and to close that gap you need the parent. Our school could not be without the involvement of our parents, without their dedication and their hard work. There is very little that we do, and we are doing something all the time, that does not involve parent participation. You must have that, and you must also have teacher involvement and a closeness that can exist between the three—the staff, the teacher, the child and the parent.

I feel that some of the innovative things that we have done in education have surpassed anything that I have ever dreamed of as an educator. I think that the problems that we are having in our educational systems today throughout this country could well look at some of the working, successful, innovative programs that are operating. There can be an exchange of ideas of the accountabililty.

Our children take the same sort of tests, California achievement tests and the other tests that are given in public schools, and we have a school where our children are in the 80th percentile of learning in this State, which is almost unheard of in most of the schools.

I would like to say that the International Children's School is important only because with parents and with people, we had no Government money. We were able to create a very fantastic plan, a very fantastic program that always involved community people, community leaders, people who have something to contribute, to bring them into the school to motivate the children. We have very few problems in this school. We have no narcotic problems. We never have. We have a school that since 1975, I don't think we have had one child to play hookey from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. 5 days a week.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Gloria Searls follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GLORIA SEARLS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S SCHOOL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

What role exists for the Federal Government in facilitating quality education and school success?

That a criteria be set for all schools in America no matter where they are and who they are for, be it for the children of Indians, immigrants, the ghetto or the privileged.

That the Federal Government assumes the role of keeper and perpetuator of these schools.

That requirements be made of States to distribute State funds and keep a balanced method among communities where it may be necessary to teach parents about the educational goals being set for their children.

The Federal Government should aid in promoting the realism of our present family structure so that its existence is accepted with dignity. Programs shoud be designed to assist the huge percentages of single and poor families to have the same status which seems automatic for the traditional family structure. Children and parents must be allowed a positive place in American life.

What factors contribute to schools effectiveness?

The school facility.—No longer can the poor be housed in bleak and barren educational facilities. High standards of respect between teacher and student should be expected and required. Families must be encouraged to provide consistency in life style for their children as well as themselves. They should be given the opportunity to become a part of the American dream of living a good life.

Teachers should be made accountable for the charge of educating children beyond the content of books.

The school and the learned should promote activities of discovery for parents and children.

The new reality that has not been faced with dignity and respect is what makes a family today. There should be a lot of counseling and guidance for single parents (in groups for interaction). There have been a few attempts made (sometimes unrealistic and highly glamorized in films). There is so much confusion and loneliness with this newly emerged single and often poor family.

People, parents and children need to feel good about themselves.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH SCHOOL CLIMATE IS A CRITICAL ELEMENT IN THE LEARNING PROCESS AND IN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

There is indeed an educational evolution throughout America. The progress and changes that are occurring in our American society are happening so fast that many adults do not comprehend this magnitude of change. It is difficult for people to cope with life.

Our schools are obligated to assist teachers in learning the scope and the core of these changes in order for them to fulfill the educational needs of the children. There are adjustments to be made to worldwide development from the OPEC to man's discoveries in Science, space exploration and the broadening new techniques of communication. Television and the technologies involved with all changes require a different kind of career motivation. We must use current events as a strong teacher learning motivation tool. Teachers are obligated to make children become aware of world changes and world development.

How can we make our urban schools more instructionally effective for poor children?

By realizing that a gap of information exists among the poor.

By realizing and creating innovative methods to minimize that gap.

Teaching children by allowing them to do, see and discover.

Bring in people to give information for career motivation.

By giving praise for achievement and effort.

By giving help when needed, rather than emphasizing failure.

By building upon those moments of happiness and helping to minimize the moments of despair which children experience.

By doing whatever is necessary to help break failure syndroms that prevail among poor children.

Yet, as an educator, I believe in America and its free educational system. Never before in history has there been anything better.

Where poor children are concerned, I refuse to ever use the phrase or think that "equal educational opportunities exist for all". This phrase is an over used farce and the shame of our country.

This meeting today before congressional representatives gives hope that it will continue to improve.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you. Ms. Esparza.

STATEMENT OF SOPHIA ESPARZA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PARENTS INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY ACTION (PICA)

Ms. **Esparza**. Thank you very much.

I am quite pleased to be here, and a little nervous as well, so bear with me if I am not up to key in my speech today.

First of all, let me tell you a little bit about myself and then a little bit about the organization that I represent and that will give you an idea as to where I come from.

My name is Sophia Esparza, and I am the executive director of an organization called PICA. The acronym stands for Parents Involved in Community Action. We have been in existence entering into our 12th year. We started strictly as a voluntary organization of parents in the Los Angeles Unified School District and now have formed our own organization. So I am a paid staff member as well as a parent with a child in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and I was once a teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District and have long since left.

I was asked by your letter to come here and address the current status of education in Los Angeles. I have attempted to do so from a perspective that maybe is good and bad, so I may be lynched when I leave this table today, but it may give you a perspective, as well, as to what is happening.

First of all, I don't know if anyone who has preceded me has given you an idea of what the ethnic composition of this district is.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Yes. That has been done several times.

Ms. **Esparza**. Wonderful. So then you know that the district has very rapidly become minority in the last 10 years and it is predominantly growing Hispanic. The school district has not released its most current figures, but from the best estimations we figure 83 percent of the entering kindergarteners are Hispanic youngsters, most of them non-English speaking or limited English speaking. So I will address that.

The quality of education in Los Angeles must be viewed with different variables taken into account. Education in our community does not exist in a vacuum or a void. Politics, dwindling financial resources, changing social mores, and a diverse student population affects the quality of education offered to children in our schools.

The Los Angeles Unified School District has all of these conditions presently facing it—and they are going to have to meet this challenge in the future. The concern, at least from our perspective in FICA, with regard to our school district mounts daily when we read about school districts across the Nation, particularly on the east coast, that are folding due to their fiscal responsibility.

Education has become a political battleground where public opinion and prejudice govern and the education of children becomes expendable. Issues such as desegregation, bilingual education, and balanced budgets are discussed without any forethought of what it means to children and their future.

What makes for effective schools and school programs, especially for poor and minority children? The answer isn't new and it isn't an easy one to accomplish. Social scientists and educational scientists have written numerous volumes on the decline of urban schools, and some of them have even posed answers as to what to do with them. However, as a member of this school community and as the executive director of this parent advocacy group, my view of the Los Angeles Unified School District may be a little different from what you have heard.

The decline of public schools has become the cry that is voiced throughout all segments of our society. In Los Angeles, we have experienced something that may not hold true for the rest of the Nation, and I urge you to keep this in mind when I speak to it.

In 1971, through active community pressure, reading improvement was a LAUSD goal. At that time we called it the superintendent's preferred reading program. The district set goals for reading gains. Each of the schools was to identify a set reading program and carry it out for 5 years. We found out in the Los Angeles Unified School District that there were something like 361 different reading programs. That means that almost every single elementary school had a different reading program and then it varied from classroom to classroom. So if you were a teacher in the first grade, you might have the Houghton-Mifflin Series, and if you were a teacher in the fifth grade, you could have the Satayana Series, and there was no one who was really following or tracking reading.

So the Mexican-American Education Commission—and Mr. Arreola is not here right now to address this—decided that they were going to push for the reading program to be a particularly important area that we would concentrate our efforts in. The results in Hispanic schools were somewhat startling. When reading scores started, they were at the 15th percentile on the norm test of the California test of basic skills. We saw an improvement districtwide not only in the minority schools but in the white schools as well, and Hispanic schools at the end of a 5-year period had gone from the 15th percentile in reading to the 35th. So we had in 5 years managed to make a 20 percentile point in reading.

What has this effort shown us? It clearly demonstrates that teachers across the district weren't teaching reading, not in white schools, not in black schools, not in brown schools. When everybody said let's start teaching reading, reading was being taught. I am not saying they were doing a tremendous job, but they were doing something.

It is also shown that through this program, the Los Angeles Unified School District has held steadfast at maintaining its reading scores at the 35th reading percentile. Now, that is not to say that there is not a school in this district that is reading at the 3d percentile and one that isn't reading at the 89th. We have one school that is reading at the 95th percentile. But the average right now in this school district is about the 45th.

So while other systems are experiencing losses, the Los Angeles Unified School District has held firm. That is not to say they are doing a great job and everything is hunky-dory here. We are still at national norm. But we have not experienced since 1975 a decline, a steady decline that you see in other educational systems. For this school district, reading has improved and math scores show that this last year, particularly for non-English-speaking and limited-English-speaking students, reading has improved. This is not to negate that racial and ethnic and economic factors don't come in to bear on learning. It does demonstrate the teacher perception and expectations make a difference. It also shows that the presence or absence of school violence does contribute to school staff behavior and child learning.

There is plenty of work ahead of us to improve learning. However, I cannot in all honesty say that the decline of this school system has occurred in the last, let's say, 5 to 7 years. We have held firm. We have made no gain, but we haven't lost anything.

Los Angeles presently faces the following: A city that is undergoing racial metamorphosis in terms of student population. Ethnically, the district has changed in the last 10 years from being 70 percent white to being 83 percent minority. Linguistically, Los Angeles has over 50 percent of the non-English- speaking or limited-English-speaking students in the entire State of California, and socially and financially, parents in this district have changed from being middle class to poor, unemployed, or underemployed, and in a large number of cases they are new immigrant parents with few resources and little knowledge or understanding of customs, lifestyle, and educational expectations that we have in this country.

The district, by virtue of its legal and political realities, has made many parents face some very hard truths. Among them are that minority parents and children are not represented adequately by the present board of education; second, that parents lack local control of schools due to a desegregation court order and/or little access to their politically elected officials. By this I mean that our present school board is recalcitrant. They don't care about any other child in this school district except white children, and they have been so caught up with the desegregation court order, fighting it, that they have not paid any attention to learning at all in this district since we have been under court ruling. They have been so busy stopping busing that they don't know what else to do.

Yet when the child learns or doesn't learn, the parents must face the failure of an educational system that they weren't responsible for and had no access to. These hard realities of life for both parents and school staff often lead to confrontive rather than cooperative exchanges, and they seem to be fighting one against the other.

I am not able to take you through a magical tour of this school district on a carpet ride, but if we could, and if your child were Hispanic and presently attending the Los Angeles Unified School District, this is probably what he or she would confront: Attendance at a segregated school. Our school is under court order to institute a voluntary desegregation plan. I am not trying to be disparaging to the Los Angeles Unified School District or its staff, but even if everyone in this district wanted to desegregate, the plan would not be feasible. We cannot accommodate all minority children in a desegregated setting due to the decline of white students in this district.

That child would probably be in an overcrowded school. Hispanic schools are severely overcrowded. I have an example here. My Xerox machine broke down, so I have only one copy. This demonstrates how the conditions are in some of these schools, and I have given you an example.

Hoover Elementary, that is only about 3.5 miles away from here, was built for 400 children. The campus currently houses 2000 youngsters. It is on a year-round schedule. It is on double session, and they are busing out youngsters. It is interesting, you will note, that they are busing out youngsters from Hoover. If you decide that you want to stay in your local neighborhood school, you probably would have to attend an overcrowded school because there is no vacancy within a 10- to 15-mile radius of our severely overcrowded schools, so our kids have to ride buses for 40 to 45 minutes.

It isn't limited to the elementary level. Belmont High School is busing 1,100 youngsters out of its high school. That is an entire high school that is rolling on buses to another area of the Los Angeles Unified School District because of the severe overcrowding.

Even if you do stay at your local neighborhood school and you aren't bused, if that is what some parents want—my child is riding on the PWT bus right now, so I have nothing against it; I am just using it as an example—and if your child is non-English speaking or limited English speaking, the quality of education further diminishes. There are not enough bilingual programs, there are not enough bilingual teachers or bilingual teacher aides to provide a meaningful bilingual program. The dearth of bilingual materials available is criminal. We have nothing with which to teach them.

I am not even addressing the quality of the materials that we do have. We just don't even have enough. Mr. Jackson mentioned that there were no textbooks. If there are no textbooks in English, be assured that there are no textbooks in any other languge, be it Chinese, Cantonese, Filipino, or Spanish.

The LAUSD is in noncompliance with the Office of Civil Rights with regard to LAU remedies. During the desegregation court case, the judge heard testimony that 60 percent of all LES/NES youngsters in this school district were receiving no program assistance—60 percent.

With all of this in mind, you can see the phenomenal task before the district. Any gains that have been made in this district have been in spite of the board of education. It is our belief at PICA that children, regardless of race, creed, or color, can learn to read, can learn to write, and can learn to compute if teachers simply taught them to do so. The reality is that they are not being taught.

We recognize that poor children have not had and are not given full access to equal opportunities, and therein is our present problem. I earlier stated that public opinion was the one that governed our schools. It is public opinion that now wants to destroy our public school system. The white public sees no vested interest or wish to educate minority children. They perceive public schools as being maintained for the benefit of the poor and the minority.

We have problems, but in Los Angeles, in spite of so many problems and tremendous obstacles, we have been able to maintain, hold a holding pattern, if you will, instead of declining. Recognizing all of this, I would urge the subcommittee not to forget the role of the Federal Government. One of you asked that of Mr. Jackson earlier. It has been through Federal law and mandates that minority and poor parents have been able to fight local repressive and discriminatory policies.

I would further recommend that the committee take a real hard look at current moneys and how the States will allocate these dollars. I am very fearful that they are going to not work to the benefit of poor and minority youngsters.

Bilingual education is to sunset in Washington in 1984 if I am not mistaken. So the rumor goes. Bilingual programs have been critiqued, reviewed, and researched, yet we have only had them for a period of and in actual existence across the Nation possibly about 7 years. The first 3 years were implementation programs. Maybe we have had a program now for 7 years, yet no one has really begun to look at the ineffective ways that other moneys have been spent.

I don't mean to earmark title I moneys, but title I moneys I think have in a sense helped us and in a sense really hurt us because it is the welfare mentality that has been created in the school districts and the school district staffs by receiving title I money. You get title I money because your kids are not reading at a certain level. Once the kid jumps over that certain level, or the whole entire school, the school loses the money. In many cases, it behooves school districts to maintain kids not reading in order to get that Federal dollar.

So rather than to give remedial money, why don't you give enrichment money? I think it would really begin to alter teacher perception.

When the Federal budgets are balanced, please don't do it at a constituency of children who don't have lobbyists. Somebody said that they don't. They really don't have anyone to speak for them, and many times parents don't know how to speak, at least minority parents who come from a different country and are really coming, and buy hook, line, and sinker the American dream and the fact that everybody can fall in and learn, and pull yourself up by your bootstraps. In many cases people don't have even boots by which to pull themselves up.

The ultimate question, one of the questions you asked, is: What is a successful educational program for poor children? You saw Mr. McKenna sitting here before you. It is clear. All you need is a good strong administrator who understands the community, who is sensitive to it, who can relate to it. A principal who can, in turn, motivate and inspire his teachers to teach, and if they are unable to do so, if he has the courage, or she has the courage, to move them out.

What does the future hold for our children in public education? Only that which you, the Congress and the Senate and this Nation will mandate of local districts. The role of the Federal Government becomes increasingly more important.

At this point I would like to mention one thing: If you follow local school boards, I know that one gets caught up with the unemployment rate and all the other things, but if you were to look at local school boards, if you were to take a good, hard, steadfast look at our school board, I think you would see that they are bigoted, they just don't give a damn. When I see Miss Weintraub, when she was president of the board, stand before us and say to us, minority parents, "What has happened to our children?" She wasn't talking about my child. She was talking about white children in the valley who she said had flown the coop. When you see Mr. Bartman, who refuses now, as board president, to consolidate and close underutilized schools, and he doesn't want to bus white youngsters a mile and a half from Prairie Elementary to Hesby Elementary—it is only a mile and a half; he doesn't want to consolidate those two schools.

Our title I moneys, the ones that you give us and our local schools supplant, we pay for coordinators, for principals, out of that Federal dollar, while they take money out of the general fund to maintain a principal at $45,000 a year for only 150 kids out in the valley. We, the minority youngsters, my child, maintains that. And he can sit there and he can say to us that he will not bus those children a mile and a half because the school semester has started, because it would disrupt their educational experience. And my child has to go either to an overcrowded school, has to either attend half-a-day sessions, or he has to ride the bus for 45 minutes. I tell you, there is something inequitable here.

But I don't want to leave you with the idea that your Federal dollar has done nothing. Your Federal dollar has opened the eyes of many parents. Your Federal dollar has in many cases provided for programs that this school board would not provide otherwise. But when people tell you that your Federal dollar is wasted and that our schools are declining, I tell you that you do have success to some degree, a small degree, in Los Angeles. And when you go back to Washington and you revamp your entire educational program, or whoever allocates Federal moneys, I would really urge you to get staff that begins to look at the west coast with eyes, because social scientists write about education on the eastern seaboard of this Nation and all that happens to children on the eastern seaboard. Research is rarely done on the west coast, and when moneys come to be allocated, they aren't given to this school district over here.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Sophia Esparza follows:]

Prepared Statement of Sophia Esparza, Executive Director, Parents Involved in Community Action

The status and quality of education in Los Angeles must be viewed with all variables taken into account. Education does not exist in a void or vacuum. Politics, dwindling financial resources, changing social mores, and a diverse student population affects the quality of education offered to children in our schools.

The Los Angeles Unified School District has all of these conditions facing it presently and in the future. The concern over the future of our school district mounts daily when we read how our districts, across the nation have fared.

Education has become the political battle ground where public opinion and prejudice govern and the education of children becomes expendable. Desegregation, bilingual education, and balanced budgets are discussed without any forethought of what it means to children and their future.

What makes for effective schools and school programs especially for poor and minority children? The answer isn't new or an easy one to accomplish. Social and educational scientists have written numerous volumes on the decline of our urban school systems. Many of them have even posed solutions.

As a member of this school community and as executive director of a parent advocacy group, my view of Los Angeles Unified Schools may be somewhat different from what you've heard or read.

The decline of public schools has become a cry that is voiced by all segments of our society. In Los Angeles, we have experienced something that may not hold true for the rest of the Nation. In 1971, through active community pressure, reading improvement was a LAUSD goal. The district set goals for reading gains. Each school was to identify a set reading program and carry it through for 5 years. The results were that Hispanic schools started with reading scores of 15 percentile on the normed test (California Test of Basic Skills, CTBS). We saw an improvement and increase district-wide, not only in minority schools but white schools as well. Hispanic schools were reading at the 35th percentile at the end of the 5 years.

What has that effort shown us? It clearly demonstrated that teachers weren't teaching reading in any school. It also has shown that through that program, LAUSD has held steadfast in maintaining a 35 percentile in reading scores. So while other school systems were experiencing a loss, we in Los Angeles held firm.

This year LAUSD has improved reading and math scores for NESLES youngsters. This is not to negate that racial, ethnic, and economic factors don't come to bear on learning. It demonstrates that teacher perception and expectations do make a difference. The presence or absence of school violence does contribute to school staff behavior and child learning. There is plenty of work ahead to improve learning. However, one cannot in all honesty say that schools have declined or deteriorated in this school system.

Los Angeles presently faces the following:

A city undergoing a radical metamorphosis in it's student population.

Ethnically, the District has changed in the last 10 years from being 70 percent to being 83 percent minority.

Linguistically, Los Angeles has a little over 50 percent of all Non-English or Limited-English speaking students in the entire state of California.

Socially and financially, parents in the District have changed from being middle class to poor unemployed, or underemployed. In a large number of cases, they are new immigrant parents with fewer resources and little knowledge or understanding of our customs, life styles and educationally expectations.

The district by virtue of legal and political realities has made parents confront some hard truths. Among these are that minority parents and children are not represented adequately by the present board of education members; parents lack local control of schools due to desegregation court order and/or little access to their elected officials. Yet, when the child learns or doesn't, parents must face the failure of an educational system they weren't responsible for.

These hard realities of life for both parents and school staffs often lead to confrontive rather than cooperative exchanges. They seem to be fighting across purposes.

We are unable to take a magical carpet ride through Los Angeles. However, if we could and if your child were Hispanic and presently attending LAUSD, this is what he or she would probably confront.

(1) Attendance at a segregated school. Our district is under court order to institute a voluntary desegregation plan. I am not being disparaging to the LAUSD. Even if everyone wanted to desegregate every school, the plan would be unfeasible. We can not accommodate all minority children due to the decline of white students.

(2) It would probably be an overcrowded school. Hispanic schools are severely overcrowded, (Exhibit I). As an example, Hoover Elementary was built to accommodate 400 children. The campus currently houses 2000 plus on a year round schedule, double session and bus out on the voluntary plan. One option may be to attend a different school, but the bus ride would be 40 to 45 minutes long. There is no school in the immediate area with vacancies. The situation of over crowding isn't limited to elementaries. Belmont High School buses 1100 children to another school.

(3) However, regardless, if he attends a neighborhood school or is bused, if your child is NES-LES the quality of his education is further diminished. There are not enough bilingual teachers, teacher aides to provide a meaningful program. The dearth of bilingual materials is criminal. We won't even address the quality at this point. LAUSD is in non-compliance with the office of Civil Rights. During the desegregation court case, evidence was presented that 60 percent of all NES-LES students were receiving no services. I suspect we must augment that figure due to the increase in this student population and the lack of gains in hiring bilingual personnel, (Exhibit II).

With the foregoing in mind, we can see the phenomenal task before this district. It has often been in spite of the district that anything has been accomplished. Yet, children regardless of race, creed or color can learn to read, write and compute if they are simply taught.

We recognize that poor and minority children have not and are not given full access to equal opportunities. And therein is our present problem. I earlier stated that public opinion governs our schools. It is public opinion that now wants to destroy our public school system. The white public sees no vested interest or wish to educate minority children. They perceive public schools as being maintained for the benefit of the poor and the minority. Yes, we have problems. But in Los Angeles, we have fought tremendous obstacles that other declining school systems have not faced or been challenged with.

Recognizing all of this, I would urge this subcommittee not to forget the role of the Federal Government. It has been through Federal law and mandates that minority and poor parents have been able to fight local repressive and discriminatory policies.

I would further recommend that the committee take a hard look at current Federal moneys and how the States will allocate these dollars. Bilingual education is to sunset in 1984. Bilingual programs have been critiqued, reviewed and researched. They have been said to be ineffective and provide little benefit to students. I would urge that same review process to be used with title-I moneys. The welfare mentality that results from maintaining children at a "non-functional level" so as to keep the money is terribly damaging. Allocate money to enrich, not to remediate learning programs.

When Federal budgets are balanced, don't do it at the expense of a constituency of children who can't lobby.

Ultimately, one of your questions was what is a successful educational program for poor children. A school needs a strong administrator. A principal who can motivate and inspire his teachers to teach children. A principal who ultimately makes them teach.

What does the future hold for our children and public education? Only that which the Federal Government will mandate local districts to do. The role of the Federal Government is increasingly more important.

EXHIBIT II.—LEP NEP/TEACHERS IN ADMINISTRATIVE AREA 6

	Total LEP/NEP Spanish	Total LEP/NEP others	Teachers A level	Teachers B level	Total Teachers A & B	Need TP/20	Teacher vs Need + or −	Students without teacher
Albion Street	186	2	0	0	0	9.3	−9.3	186
Ann Street	180	1	3	1	4	9.0	−5.0	100
Belvedere	604	0	16	4	20	30.2	−10.2	204
Breed Street	306	6	6	5	11	15.3	−4.3	85
Bridge Street	296	9	0	0	0	14.3	−14.3	286
Brooklyn Avenue	227	0	7	3	10	11.4	−1.4	27
Bushnell Way	31	9	3	1	4	1.5	+2.5	0
Castelar	143	484	0	0	0	7.2	−7.2	143
City Terrace	172	2	30	0	30	8.6	+21.4	0
Dacotah Street	445	14	0	0	0	22.3	−22.3	445
Eastman Avenue	754	0	19	9	28	37.7	−9.7	194

EXHIBIT II.—LEP NEP/TEACHERS IN ADMINISTRATIVE AREA 6—Continued

	Total LEP/NEP Spanish	Total LEP/NEP others	Teachers A level	Teachers B level	Total Teachers A & B	Need TP/20	Teacher vs Need + or −	Students without teacher
El Sereno	274	6	9	1	10	13.7	3.7	74
Euclid Avenue	447	25	0	0	0	22.4	22.4	447
Evergreen Avenue	475	0	0	0	0	23.8	23.8	475
Farmdale	225	57	0	0	0	11.3	11.3	225
First Street	334	5	4	7	11	16.7	5.7	114
Ford Boulevard	547	0	0	0	0	27.4	27.4	547
Fourth Street	305	3	0	0	0	15.3	15.3	305
Gates Street	467	45	13	7	20	23.4	+3.4	0
Glen Alta	193	97	0	0	0	9.7	9.7	193
Griffin Avenue	160	13	0	0	0	8.0	8.0	160
Hammel Street	555	2	0	0	0	27.8	27.8	555
Harrison	373	1	5	7	12	18.7	6.7	133
Hillside	334	34	0	0	0	16.7	16.7	334
Humphreys Avenue	509	0	0	0	0	25.5	25.5	509
Huntington Drive	420	13	28	2	30	21.0	+9.0	0
Kennedy, Robert F.	358	0	20	2	22	17.9	+4.1	0
Lane, Robert Hill	29	27	0	0	0	1.5	1.5	29
Latona, Avenue	102	14	2	7	9	5.1	+3.9	0
Lorena Street	617	1	0	0	0	30.9	30.9	617
Malabar Street	380	0	19	6	25	19.0	+6.0	0
Marianna Avenue	160	0	.	3	7	8.0	1.0	20
Multnomah	47	3	1	0	1	2.4	1.4	27
Murchison Street	544	0	0	0	0	27.2	27.2	544
Rowan Avenue	716	0	0	0	0	35.8	35.8	716
Riggin	64	0	0	3	3	3.2	+.2	0
Second Street	435	7	40	1	41	21.8	+19.2	0
Sheridan Street	647	3	0	0	0	32.4	32.4	647
Sierra Park	256	17	0	0	0	12.8	12.8	256
Sierra Vista	114	9	6	2	8	5.7	2.3	114
Soto Street	310	0	1	0	0	15.5	15.5	310
Utah Street	468	0	5	3	8	23.4	15.4	308
Riggin Magnet Center	11	0	2	1	3	.6	+2.4	0
Total	14,210	812	242	78	318	355.9	−469.1	9,330

Note.—Teacher to pupil need is based on 20 students or two-thirds of normal class size of 30.

EXHIBIT II.—LEP NEP/TEACHERS IN ADMINISTRATIVE AREA 2

	Total LEP/NEP Spanish	Total LEP/NEP all others	Teachers A level	Teachers B level	Total Teach A & B	Need TP/20	Teacher vs Need + or −	Students without teachers
Ascot Avenue	99	0	1	2	3	5.0	2.0	40
Bryson Avenue	142	5	1	2	3	7.1	4.1	82
Compton Avenue	20	0	0	0	0	1.0	1.0	20
Corona Avenue	596	14	140	3	17	29.8	12.8	256
Elizabeth Street	653	27	5	3	8	32.7	24.7	494
Fishburn Avenue	487	10	9	2	11	24.4	13.4	268
Florence Avenue	657	0	12	6	18	32.9	14.9	298
Graham	293	0	20	0	2	14.7	12.7	253
Grape Street	49	0	1	1	3	2.5	.5	29
Heliothrope	552	3	1	2	3	27.6	24.6	492
Holmes Avenue	38	0	1	0	1	1.9	.9	18
Hooper Avenue	280	0	3	0	3	14.0	11.0	220
Liberty Boulevard	709	0	5	7	12	35.5	23.5	469
Lillian Street	322	0	7	5	12	16.1	4.1	82
Loma Vista Avenue	632	4	16	6	22	31.6	9.6	192
McKinley Avenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middleton Street	1,058	14	0	0	0	52.9	52.9	1,058
Miles Avenue	558	10	21	2	23	27.9	4.9	98

EXHIBIT II.—LEP NEP/TEACHERS IN ADMINISTRATIVE AREA 2—Continued

	Total LEP/NEP Spanish	Total LEP/NEP all others	Teachers A level	Teachers B level	Total Teach A & B	Need TP/20	Teacher vs Need + or −	Students without teachers
Miramonte	784	0	24	8	32	39.2	7.2	144
Nevin Avenue	246	1	1	1	2	12.3	10.3	206
99th Street	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
92nd Street	73	0	0	0	0	3.7	3.7	73
96th Street	38	0	0	0	0	1.9	1.9	38
111th Street	46	0	0	1	1	2.3	1.3	26
109th Street	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102nd Street	35	0	1	1	2	1.8	.2	0
116th Street	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112th Street	3	0	0	0	0	.2	.2	3
Park Avenue	392	3	8	4	12	19.6	7.6	152
Parmalee Avenue	415	1	1	3	4	20.8	16.8	335
Ritter	35	1	0	1	1	1.8	.8	15
Russell	79	0	0	0	0	3.4	3.4	79
San Gabriel Avenue	252	13	0	0	0	12.6	12.6	252
Stanford Avenue	867	11	0	0	0	43.4	43.4	867
State Street	325	13	0	0	0	16.3	16.3	325
Tweedy	142	6	3	0	3	7.1	4.1	82
Vernon City	129	2	0	0	0	6.5	6.5	129
Victoria Avenue	359	7	0	0	0	18.0	18.0	359
Wadsworth Avenue	194	3	1	0	1	9.7	8.7	174
Weigand Street	50	0	1	0	1	2.5	1.5	30
Woodlawn Avenue	366	16	0	0	0	18.3	18.3	366
San Pedro Street	648	0	8	4	12	62.4	20.4	408
20th Street	403	0	2	5	7	20.2	23.2	263
111th St. Magnet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112nd St. Magnet	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13,027	164	159	71	218	651.6	−433.6	18,695

Note.—Teacher to pupil need is based on 20 students or two-thirds of normal class size of 30.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Ms. Esparza.

Let us hear briefly from the other two witnesses, and then we will question all of them together.

Mr. Francis, Bob Francis?

STATEMENT OF BOB FRANCIS

Mr. **Francis**. Thank you very much, Congressman Hawkins and subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today and I am going to address myself to parent participation in schools. That is what I am all about.

Let me give you a little background, just a brief background, on Bob Francis.

I spent 20 years in the Army playing trombone, and I spent another 10 years with the Government doing other things overseas. I came here to Los Angeles in 1971 and entered my children into Los Angeles city schools, at the 99th Street school. Ever since then, for the last 10 years, I have been involved in the schools. Right now I am a member of the advisory at Brett Hart, one of those fine schools that Mr. McKenna talked about, Gompers Junior High School, and Locke High School. I have been at Locke for the last 6 years.

Fortunately, just on my birthday on the 4th of November, to show you how we are advancing, there are not many men that participate in the schools. Just on Wednesday, the 4th of November, I am so proud to say we had an election on the advisory, and out of the five positions we had four men to do this. Now, the ladies tell me, out of all the years, they have never had this. But this is the progress.

Now, I think Bob Francis had something to do with that because I have been talking to men. For the last 8 years, I have been involved in Project Follow-Through. President Reagan caused me to retire because he has taken the job away from me, so now I am retired from Los Angeles city schools. But during those 8 years, we have organized, if you wish, Men's Clubs, or Dads Clubs. Some schools call them Dads Clubs. This is parent participation.

We had 15 schools involved, 9 in South Central and 6 on the East Side. The black and brown we used to call them. We had a program where we would take those 15 schools on a camping trip during the summer. Now, we are not talking about using all of your Government moneys to do this. We had a lot of parent volunteers. We had some teachers, but most of this was parent volunteers. We would go out on a Friday, stay until Sunday morning, and then come back. Monday we would start getting ready. We did this for five weekends.

To make a long story short, we did this on snow trips with 15 schools on the weekend, the same thing. Now, what we were doing was giving children, boys and girls in Los Angeles city schools in that particular area, in the inner city, the opportunity to see men doing their thing, so to say. These are children without fathers in the home, and we were giving them a father image. I think we were successful, because we would settle some discipline problems in the schools because these children were looking forward to going on some of those trips. So what we would do, we would have the teacher identify some of these problem children, the children that didn't have fathers in their homes, and we would do this.

At Washington High School, as far as the parents are concerned, the Dads Club and the parents, we had a carnival over there. Now, this is in the violent area. A lot of people said, "You can't have this in that area. You can't have a carnival in that area. You have too many gangs." Sure we had gangs, but the community wanted this, and we rounded the community up and the community walked around the grounds and we had no problems with gangs as far as Washington High School was concerned.

We had a carnival at Fremont High School. We did the same thing. No problem. At Wadsworth—we are talking about three different years. In 1979, at an elementary school, we had a carnival and a Christmas party, with parents being involved. Through the parents, they went to businesses and Mattel and got toys. We gave away 2,000 toys for the children of these nine schools in Follow-Throu h. Then we even gave the parents 50 gifts, single gifts. We had them wrapped.

So these are some of the positive things that parents do in the schools. That is why I would not like to see the parent involvement in the schools be disseminated. Right now Washington High School, Brett Hart, and 95th has this program going now, and my little girl is at Brett Hart. The principal wants the parents to come in and evaluate the program. He wants this. He doesn't want to keep the parents out. He wants this, because he feels that outside eyes can see some of the things that they don't see. So he welcomes this, and we are going to do this.

At Locke High School, I encourage parents to go to Locke. I go to Locke every morning because I have a problem with the students not going to class on time. So every time I see this, I just go to the assistant principal and I say, "Hey, what is going on here?" Then the whole staff comes out and they start getting the kids to class. So now they have a program because I have gotten some parents to come there and watch. This is what you have to do at the schools. The parents have to come and be watchdogs, if your children are going to get a good education.

Some of the principals do mind it, but a lot of the principals don't mind you doing that because they welcome the help of the parents. So I think we are doing a pretty good job as parents, and I don't think we should be denied the privilege of coming into the school and helping. Now, I know the Government says "Keep going to the schools," but they do need some of the moneys. We have found out that in the compensatory education, the community aides that are hired with that compensatory education money, a lot of those aides have gone back to school and have gone to college and have become teachers. I can name four or five right in the inner city. I know of three that came from 99th Elementary School who have gone back. And incidentally, they are damn good teachers, because a couple of them have had my children.

So I could give you a lot of history about parent participation in the inner city schools. It is just too bad that I can only go to four. I wish I could go to all of them, but I can't spread myself that thin. But there are things going on. I talk to other parents, and there are some other parents in other schools that want to see this done, and they hang in there in those schools.

I had a couple of other things here, and then I will be through.

The gifted at Locke. You see, when we talk about compensatory, we don't want to talk about the gifted. Now, this is a pathetic thing. If the gifted needs to use a machine at a school and it is title I, the first thing they say, "Hey, the gifted can't use this because it is title I moneys. You can't use this if it is title I moneys." What is the difference? All of the children are getting an education. This is something that needs to be straightened out.

Gifted parents, when they have meetings, they line the walls. That is how interested they are. And they have no problems with their children. So this is one of the things we have to look at. Some of those guidelines that you have to use in spending that money is too tight. And please, please, don't let that money get in the hands of the board of education or else we are gone.

Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Francis.

Mr. Rodriguez, you indicated you wanted to make a statement. Would you try to be as brief as possible?

STATEMENT OF RON RODRIGUEZ

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. First, I am a parent at Gates Street School. We are presently on year-round. Gates Street School was built for 500 students. Let me say that Gates Street School is in East Los Angeles. It was built for 500 students, a few extra rooms were put into it, they upped the capacity to 800 students, and now there are 1,200 students.

We were put on year-round, and my analogy to what year-round is like a family having a house and the house is not big enough for them, and instead of building a bigger house somebody comes and tells that family to live there in shifts. That is what they are doing to our kids right now. You are having kids out in the streets all year-round. You have kids like my kids. My kids just came back from a 3-week vacation, but let me tell you that my kids didn't go to a year-round school all summer long. We boycotted the year-round school all summer long. We just received a letter from the superintendent of schools saying that he is going to promise to take us off year-round.

The reason that they are going to promise to take us off year-round is because of, as I said, this boycott. four hundred parents, we voted twice. They asked us to vote. One of the votes was four-hundred against, 8 for year-round. Year-round was still implemented at Gates Street School. We are wondering, you know, "Why in the hell did they ask us to vote?"

But through the pressure, like I said, the pressure that we put on, we have a promise that we are going to be taken off.

What I would like to speak about, I agree with what we have heard. We have heard really great people. We have heard Rita Walters. We have heard other teachers, Mr. McKenna. I can't really add too much to what they have said. The only thing I could really add is that I live in the community. I know what is happening right now. Like right here we are maybe fairly sophisticated, some of us educated people, trying to do something.

Right now in my community, my friends are getting loaded with drugs right now, because there isn't anything else. And their little brothers and sisters are getting loaded with drugs. Right now it is Friday night. They are trying to line up the beer. They are trying to line up the wine right now, because the only thing there is in our community right now is the drugs and the street.

There is a double standard in the society. The double standard is getting big. You think I teach my kids to say the Pledge of Allegiance, justice for all? My kids do not say the Pledge of Allegiance. I do not say the Pledge of Allegiance. Maybe that is shocking to you, but when you see my school filled, for 500 students, having 1,200 students in it now, where we have a grammar school 10 minutes away that has 250 students on 9 acres, where ours is 1,200 for 3 acres, is it a coincidence that the other school is predominantly white and our school is predominantly Mexican and Latino and Asian?

I do not think it is a coincidence. We could see these contradictions. We could see these double standards. We could see it when the board of education, they were outraged, they were outraged with busing and integration, except for Rita Walters. The rest of the board of education was outraged, adamant what was happening to their kids. What happened to their sense of outrage? Where is their sense of disgust now?

My kids, the parents, we are the ones that are outraged now. We are the ones that are demanding change. My kids go to those schools. We could see what is happening. When I was a product of those schools, when I went to college I had to study twice as hard to just be on an equal level with the students who were coming out of the other high schools. My high school did not prepare me for a college education. I had to struggle. I had to struggle intensely to try to get through college. In fact, I had to start at a junior college just so I could get into a State college.

So what do we find now? We find these double standards. You find kids that don't have anything but the streets. I was a youth counselor for 4 years, with a gang worker. That was a CETA program. We were terminated. We used to take kids out, like the gentleman was saying here. We used to take them out to outings, and the kids responded to that. There aren't any more programs like that now. I am serious when I say there is only the drugs and the streets there.

People are talking about what is wrong with the kids. They are shooting up each other. I have friends that are dying. I have friends that have died. I have had friends that have overdosed. I have best friends that have overdosed because of what we find in the schools and what we find in the communities. We are tired of this. And what we see, the kids go home and on television they see other people with their fine—have every sort of social mobility, able to buy yachts, able to buy boats, able to buy new cars. They see it all around them.

Do you think these kids are going to stay in these communities? Do you think they are going to stay there and be content with what they have? Hell, no, they are not. Even though I don't agree with this article that was written a couple of months ago in the Los Angeles Times about the marauders from the inner cities, it is fact. But it is a fact that these kids from these communities are not staying in these communities any more. Remember Ribicoff's daughter that was shot? People in the communities, my friends, these little kids, they don't care. They will come and shoot you. They will come and shoot you out in the street just to take $5 out of your pocket, and maybe not even to take that $5; just, like we say in Spanish, for a jugada, for fun, because they have been oppressed, they have been going through a violent system, they have seen a school system that doesn't give a damn about them, so they don't give a damn about anybody else.

So the only thing that I can see now is, we have the ideas, we have the creative ideas. It is too bad Mr. McKenna is not our President; not the president of the board of education, but the President of the United States. We have ideas, we have creative ideas. We could take, like we were saying about the parents, the parents coming down and working with the schools, we see that. Right now, if we were in the schools and we had a larger say-so, we could deal with the violence. Like right now we have high school students, why can't we get creative programs, have these high school students come down and work with the junior high school kids, their brothers and sisters that are getting out of line. They would keep them in line.

We could have these high school programs and pay these high school kids. We could pay kids that are out on the streets doing nothing, have them come back in the schools, have them come back and learning. Gentlemen, right in the very age that we are living in, the very thing we need the most is more money and more programs, but the very opposite is happening. They are taking them away.

I don't want to say this, but it is true. It is like Nero. We are fiddling, and the society is burning around us. In society, there has been a solvent poured over the society and it has loosened the social cohesiveness. You can see that people no longer believe. I remember 5 or 10 years ago that people believed in this system, but when we had a President of the United States take the Constitution and come back to the White House and get invited back to the White House for a dinner, whereas, where I was working in programs and kids that were ditching school were being handcuffed by the cops like that, and taken in, how can we tell kids to have respect for a system that handcuffs them for ditching school when the ex-President of the United States broke the Constitution and gets invited back?

Gentlemen, we see these contradictions. I would just like to say that not all is lost. We have the ideas here. We could change this. We could turn things around. We need the moneys now. We don't need the moneys being spent in El Salvador right now. We don't need the money killing our friends and our brothers in El Salvador. We don't need, just like I read in the paper the other day, we don't need more money being spent in the Sudan. We need the money right here, right now. If we don't have this money right now, you gentlemen are sitting on a volcano.

You know, we are underneath it. You are going to catch the volcano. And I hope that we could do something, because we only have a few more years, gentlemen. Right now, the conditions we are seeing in our society are not allowing us any more time. They are talking about when we have a Congressman talking about a military coup. Schmidt talking about a military coup, where it would be good to have a military coup.

Like I said, I would like to leave you, and I think we can turn these things around, we can use these moneys, and that we only use these moneys, we have to go to the President, we have to go to everybody else. Let me just say this one last thing: Rostow, one of the leaders in the administration, said we are living not in a postwar era; we are living in a prewar era. Do you think these kids are going to go out and risk, you know, maybe going to jail for 10 years? That doesn't frighten them.

Gentlemen, every day I read the paper they are talking about—I am afraid, I am afraid. They are talking about atomic bombs. Reagan is talking about winning atomic war. I am afraid for my kids. We have to do something. You have to take this back. You have to take this back and know that the people are behind you.

Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Kildee, the people are behind you. The people didn't vote for Reagan and the people didn't vote for Carter. We had the lowest amount of election turnout since Calvin Coolidge. Reagan wasn't put in there with any mandate. The mandate they had was the people didn't want either one. We have to have creative leadership, and we can turn this country around, but if we don't do it in the next few years, gentlemen, I don't know what we are going to see, but it is going to be something very horrible.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Kildee.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It seems strange that at a time when, as you indicate, Mr. Rodriguez, the kids do turn to the drugs and to the streets, funding for public-service CETA jobs has been cut completely. To add to the irony, the same President who proposed and supported that cut is now proposing to spend more for prisons.

Mr. **Rodriguez**. That is right.

Mr. **Kildee**. It shows a lack of understanding of the causes of criminal behavior. The President is trying to deal with end results, rather than causes. I certainly have found myself, since January 20, probably more frustrated than at any other time in my life because I see such a reversal in Federal priorities.

Mr. **Rodriguez**. That is right.

Mr. **Kildee**. It is extremely frustrating. I just think, when I read about the extra dollars for the prisons, if they wanted to do both, maybe you could see something there, but when you cut off dollars that could make it far less likely for people to get on that treadmill where they wind up there in that prison, then you could say at least they are serving both ends. There was no one in the Congress—and Gus, let me do this—there was no one in the Congress who fought harder for CETA than the man sitting next to me.

He dug his heels in so strongly he wouldn't vote even on procedural things to help the President get his program through. He was an inspiration to some of us younger members. I was very proud of Gus on that.

Mr. **Rodriguez**. May I say one more thing, too, about this Federal question, just a small thing. I have heard comments made about more community control. It is a ticklish question, but let me just say that I believe in community control, but I also believe that the education in the United States should be nationalized. I believe that every kid, whether he is in Hawaii or Mississippi, should have the same amount of dollars. Don't they say that in our Constitution, that we are equal under the law, justice for everybody?

That is what I am saying. So what is happening now? Let me just say that what is happening now is analogous to Reconstruction. They are talking about wanting to give local officials more chance to implement programs. No. This is like after the Civil War. We have Congressmen like Mr. Hawkins here fighting for progressive things, fighting for things like a reconstruction, the war on poverty, fighting for CETA programs. The Reconstruction is over, and what this reconstruction is that they are turning back. Instead of having controls, guidelines, on the local races, the local races are going to be able to run amuck more now. That is what it means to us right now with these new Federal regulations.

Mr. **Kildee**. I know that some school superintendents would like to have us lay the Federal dollars out on the stump to be spent in any way the superintendents want. We do have national purposes that must be served, and that is the reason for categorical funding.

Ms. Esparza raised a very interesting point. The question of children who finally reach a certain proficiency because of title I, who then lose title I services because they no longer qualify for them. There is almost a disincentive in achievement in this case.

The law says that title I shouldn't be used for those not in need, but the rules and regulations say that it be used only for those below the grade level. I think the rules and regulations might be changed to allow children at least 3 years of participation in the program, so if they improve enough in the first year, they don't automatically drop out.

Do you want to respond to that? Do you think that might help some, if the trial could be longer?

Ms. **Esparza**. I think what you really have to begin to look at is, there has to be a way that, as the school system begins to become proficient in teaching certain things, that they see a vested interest in doing so.

When I was teaching in school and we had title I money, it was always interesting to me to think that parents really felt that they were to some degree participating in the determination of that title I budget. They in many cases were, and I am not saying all advisory councils function that way, but I do have some examples of it, that parents are somewhat rubber stamps to it.

The Federal Government has got to find a way to somehow really dig its heels in and make a school district, make a local superintendent, make a local school board responsible for making children learn, because up to now teachers get paid whether that kid is reading at the 5th percentile when he or she leaves her classroom, just as if she had put in all the effort to get that child up to the 60th or 70th percentile in reading.

We in essence have begun to reward ineffectiveness. I don't want the child to lose out on the wonderful things that title I moneys do buy. They do buy a lot of things. They do buy textbooks that the regular budget doesn't buy in many cases. They do a lot of things that the regular school board just completely ignores children on. But somehow teachers have got to be paid, rewarded, for success not failure, and I don't know how we are going to do that.

I think it is a very hard question to grapple with, and it becomes even more discouraging when you have a district the size of Los Angeles.

Mr. **Kildee**. Well, this committee certainly is interested in that problem that you have raised.

Ms. **Esparza**. I would hope that when you begin to evaulate programs, you know, we have had title I, and we haven't given other programs a chance, and I use bilingual education because that is very dear and close to my heart. I see children who just sit there and vegetate. If I had given my speech to you entirely in Spanish, it would have been worthless to you, or if I had done it in Cantonese. I have walked into classrooms where children are just not even spoken to. They don't know how to say sit down, stand up, or we are going to go play. I mean, there is no one who can communicate with them.

If we are interested in moving them, and I am not into the argument and I am not going to fall into the argument of, oh, well, should the bilingual program be maintenance and transition. I don't give a darn about that. All I want is for that kid to move into English as quickly as he can and have him be able to—I entered school speaking only Spanish.

Mr. **Kildee**. Could I ask a question just on that? Since I put together the first bilingual education bill in Michigan, that controversy has raged about whether bilingual education should be for maintenance or transition. I generally avoid it.

Ms. **Esparza**. Like me.

Mr. **Kildee**. You attached some charts to your testimony, and I want to make sure that I understand those charts correctly.

Are you saying that in area 6, 9,000 out of 15,000 Spanish-speaking students do not have bilingual education, and in area 2, 8,695 out of 13,000 do not have bilingual programs?

Ms. **Esparza**. That is correct.

Mr. **Kildee**. OK.

Ms. **Esparza**. That is only Spanish. I am not speaking of Filipino, Cantonese, or any other language.

Mr. **Kildee**. Are all those students deficient in English proficiency?

Ms. **Esparza**. They are. Let me explain the chart to you a little bit. These are all the elementary schools in the area. The Los Angeles Unified School District has something that is very curious. They test all their teachers, and they are the only district in the State of California that does so. Just to become a regular teacher or to become a bilingual teacher. So you see teachers that are called A level and B level here. A level is a person who is completely proficient in English and Spanish, is not only bilingual but biliterate, can read and write the Spanish language very well. A B-level person is a person who can speak it very well, but does not have the mastery, let's say, to teach at the fourth, fifth, and sixth, grade level technical subjects like science or mathematics that require a more sophisticated language skill and is able to transmit it.

Now, we have teachers who are on waiver, and that is a person like yourself who has the greatest intent in the world to learn Spanish, and it may take them 12 years to do so. In the meantime, we give in the State of California a waiver to a teacher for 4 to 5 years to learn Spanish, and then if they don't learn it in that amount of time, we waiver them again and they can sit there.

What happens is that children—this is interesting—children are supposed to do it in 6 months, but teachers can take 10 years, and possibly even longer.

In these two areas, which are the most segregated linguistically and the most segregated racially, area 2 is black and brown. That is probably our most integrated in terms of Hispanic and black. Area 6 is almost entirely, 90 percent, Hispanic I would say, and increasingly Asian. So the Asian numbers here I didn't calculate or tally in. I just used Spanish because 93 percent of the NES/LES students in this district are Spanish speaking.

We do not have enough teachers at all to function. In fact, in the listing of area 2, there is Middleton elementary that has 1,500 kids, and there was not one bilingual teacher for all of those kids.

So I am not even going to get into whether they have a really super-duper Cadillac program. All we need is somebody to be able to move them within the first and second year, because we know, as educators, that if we don't move that child into English by the third year in school, they have lost concept learning, and that is all I am interested in. I want them to learn to multiply. I don't care in what language. I just want them to learn the skill, and we are not even doing that.

Mr. Kildee. So the program has not yet been successful getting students to the point where they can learn other subjects efficiently.

Ms. Esparza. That is right. Looking at this school district, we figure that if we were to be able to move children from Spanish to English, or whatever language to English, if the district were to really make an effort, and if people were to buy into the program, we figure that by third grade, fourth grade, children would be functional enough where we wouldn't have to worry about them. They would be able to function at that quartile where title I can then take over, and then soon, by the sixth grade, we figure we could have successful youngsters in junior high school.

Mr. Kildee. I think that is all I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hawkins. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will forgo any further questions. I think that we have accomplished a great deal in Los Angeles today. I want to at this time express appreciation to Mr. Kildee, who came all the way out from Michigan in order to make this quorum this afternoon and has remained very patiently with us. Mr. Kildee is one of the vital members of the committee in terms of education and I think that it is most important that he has been present during this hearing today.

This morning I was asked what did we expect to accomplish. I tried to answer several of the witnesses that question, in addition to what I have heretofore expressed, and I think the fact that today we have listened to actually the inner core of the Los Angeles Unified School District, we have listened to representatives of the teachers, the teacher organizations representing the teachers, we have had an opportunity to have an input from parents at the community level, the operators of the program, together with all the interests, I think, represented in the city.

I think as a result of these hearings that they do bring about greater accountability, and the fact that there is such a committee that takes the time to come to the city, I think, and to bring these individuals together so that they hear each other speaking, sometimes for the first time, expressing themselves in no uncertain terms, that it does make them a little more accountable. We at least hope that that is true.

It has been a very patient audience today. They participated officially and unofficially in the proceedings, and we are deeply thankful, particularly for those of you who stayed throughout the day. I think we have called on everybody who expressed an interest in testifying.

Ms. German. There are some other people in the audience who would like to testify.

Mr. Hawkins. Unfortunately, there are some schedules that must be kept. I had earlier asked for those individuals who wanted to testify to let us know so we could schedule them. We took everybody who expressed an interest in testifying.

Ms. German. I came here because I had a point I wanted to make.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Well, if you can do it 1 or 2 minutes, we will do it, but please confine yourself to making a very brief statement, because we do have schedules that must be kept.

Ms. **Searls**. Before I go, may I just make one statement, please?

Mr. **Hawkins**. Surely. Absolutely.

Ms. **Searls**. As I have stated today, public education is, of course, the American way, and may it forever stay the American way. But I happen to represent one small segment, and it was unique because it was an inner city private school and we are desperately trying to maintain that private school while we are working with some 300 children year in, year out, and doing fantastic things with them.

At some point, please remember, if the name International Children's School calls upon your offices to give us some assistance on survival that this is what we are about, to continue, to maintain that very, very small segment, but it is doing such a fantastic job with parents and children in the inner city and our children are the Mexican children, the Asian children, the black children. We have them all there together.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Ms. Searls.

Now, will the other witnesses please make very brief statements so we can listen to as many as possible? Identify yourself. Will the others who wish to speak come to the table, please, at this time?

As I said, we had earlier requested this. No names were turned in. We called on everybody who did, so in asking you to be brief, I don't want you to believe that we are trying to cut you off. We are simply, as I say, trying to make time. We are deeply appreciative of your interest, and for that reason we would like to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF ALEX COTA

Mr. **Cota**. Thank you very much, Congressman Hawkins and Congressman Kildee. I appreciate very much being allowed to speak.

My name is Alex Cota, and I have been involved with the school board for quite a long time. They have been particularly against busing, and this is one thing that has severely injured our schools, academically as well as in many other respects.

One thing, Congresswoman Bobbi Fiedler always hit me with the argument that, well, our school is segregated not because of the schools, but by the accident of housing. I have given you a copy of a Los Angeles Times article from a week ago Friday, October 30, 1981, and just briefly I can give you some excerpts from that.

A man moved into an affluent area in West Hollywood. He happened to be black. He took his family away—I will just paraphrase it very quickly—while the family was away at the San Diego Zoo, vandals virtually destroyed the inside of the home. Every wall, appliance, and curtain was spray painted "Nigger" and "Black Niggers" was splashed on the walls in nearly every room. He was advised by the police to move out to a hotel.

I told Mrs. Fiedler, when she was on the school board, over and over and over again: If you are against busing, then be for integrated housing. There was always silence, which indicates clearly there was racism. They were not solely just against busing; they were definitely against integration.

Now I have been pursuing, and this is what I wanted the committee to be very aware of, I had to bring a lawsuit in the Federal courts just recently asking the school board to cease and desist from selling its surplus vacant land. We are not talking about the under-populated school that you heard about today. They are selling vacant land. They sold 7-plus acres in the valley, an area that is against integrating our schools, for over $1 million, and Bartman, Trias, Ferraro, and Weintraub voted to use the funds from the sale of surplus lands to build more segregated, isolated schools.

I said, "No, use the land for integrated housing and the kids can walk to school. You don't need busing. What is your excuse?" There was silence.

I want this committee to be fully aware, because Congresswoman Fiedler is trying to push, with Jesse Helms, a so-called constitutional amendment to outlaw busing. You can point out to her, "Well, you certainly were not for integrated housing. The school board in Los Angeles is selling surplus land." And that is exactly what they are going to try to keep pulling on us, to build more ghetto schools.

I wanted to alert this committee to it. They are misusing those funds right now, and I am going to bring still another action in the State court, since the Federal court has turned its back on it. I think it is because they are afraid of Ronald Reagan. So I am going to try again in the State courts, but it is not easy because our judiciary has been taking a pasting, which is another reason why you are very important. Our judiciary has been getting more and more timid in enforcing integration.

One of the things that is crippling our Los Angeles School District more so than if Jesse Helms and George Wallace were on our own school board is the fact that they are racists and we have definite proof, aside from the busing issue, namely, the fact that they will not use lands that the school board owns to integrate the schools. It calls for in our State—I don't have the sections with me—our State law calls for any surplus land held by any government entity should be used—one of the priorities, not the only one—for parkland, for example; but first and foremost it should be used for low-income, affordable housing.

So you should approach the cities, you know, the counties, and ask them if they want to use it for anything before they put it on the market. This school board has been ignoring that and has put it on the market and sold it to private interests so it cannot now be used for low-income housing. Our own city has been falling down on that, so this is another thing I would hope you would look for.

We have got to overcome the racism which does not allow a man to move into a neighborhood, and tears his home up, and this is not Alabama. This is Los Angeles, and I am a native of Los Angeles. This makes me ashamed. I am going to do everything in my power to help this gentleman.

I thank you very much for your time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you. Let us hear from the next witness.

STATEMENT OF SANDRA GERMAN

Ms. **German**. It is interesting that he brought that up, because when we first moved to Los Angeles 4 years ago, the house we looked at in Torrance, when we went back to visit it the second time the neighbors had been there and threatened the seller not to sell to us. So we are in the inner city by choice.

But I am here because I support parents. I have five children and they are here now. My message to you today is that parents care. I have pioneered a home learning program. I have developed a rapid reading instruction method, using my own children. It used to take me 30 to 90 days to teach a child to read, but I have refined it so that I can do it in 2 weeks flat, and I can teach other parents to do this, because I believe that our children are brilliant and I believe that early education helps them learn that the whole world is a classroom.

I believe in teaching them about their potentials, but I am offended by the lack of opportunities for my children. It is interesting that this is the only museum that has free admission here in Los Angeles. All of the other museums and zoos have admission, and the Children's Museum has an admission of $3.50 for an adult and $1.75 for children. A lot of the educational opportunities are for an elite class of people. They are not accessible to poor and limited-income people.

I have just finished purchasing $160 in outside classroom opportunities for my children for 6 weeks. I do not have that kind of money, but I believe that we must invest in our children, and I want to urge you, for one thing, to help parents learn to instruct their children, use positive methods to broaden that child's perspective, even before they get to school.

Second, I would like to urge you to make these programs, these museums, the zoos, accessible to low-income, limited-income people. A family of seven does not have $21 to go to the Children's Museum, plus busfare and parking and all of that.

I would like to thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF NISAA HASAN, ORGANIZER OF PARENT POWER

Ms. **Hasan**. My name is Nisaa Hasan, the organizer of Parent Power for Los Angeles

I think as Mr. Hawkins is aware, we do have Parent Power stimulating now from Sacramento through San Bernardino County. Some of the things that we want here in Los Angeles under Parent Power are as I have listed here, but I am going to give you something brief about the experience in America of blacks.

As you well know, the black experience in America has been and is a unique experience, that bitter and negative experience perpetuated by capitalists who have and are depriving, oppressing, repressing, and suppressing the majority of our black Afro-American society to become hardcore, hostile, and destructive not only to themselves but the total society as well.

To turn these negative forces around, you must give the black Afro-Americans and other minority groups a unique education, an education that will produce positive action to enhance self-worth, self-esteem, pride, dignity, determination, and a good, productive life.

Our needs are:

Parent involvement to insure and promote not only quality education but equal education as well.

To remove the prohibitions that tend to make parent involvement ineffective.

Remove limits which keep parents from protecting the rights to quality and equal education of all children as well as their own.

We need administrators and educators within who will instill good moral character and conscience, the willingness and ability to perform without having to be motivated by combat pay or incentive increases to teach students under so-called adverse conditions.

We need those same educators to help instill and build strong moral character and creative will from the primary grade level through senior high school in addition to teaching the three R's.

We parents not only need to sit on advisory councils and make recommendations that are tossed in wastebaskets, but to become involved with the final process of decisionmaking, school improvement, be involved in the selection of educators and principals, and the selection of instructional materials, books, et cetera.

Our needs are to make the Los Angeles school board, superintendent, principals, and fiscal administrators accountable and responsible in addition to the parent responsibility for children who remain illiterate in the educational system.

We do not need cuts in title I funds or block grants. We do need a direct allocation of funds to parents to help insure quality education and fiscal accountability. For the past 5 years we have a buildup of more than $16 million in carryover funds here in LAUSD while our children are kept disadvantaged due to a lack of books, educational tools and instructional materials. Why?

Our needs are to be respected as human beings, both our children and parents, by superintendents, administrators, and teachers. We need to remove all administrators who have track records of being demeaning, unqualified and miseducators of all of our children.

We need for our black children to also become bilingual, to have a fair share in employment opportunities. We do not need to become lost in the shuffle.

Last but not least, we need a parents' bill of rights to insure the eight points and other points to insure equal and quality education for all.

Thank you.

Mr. **Hawkins**. Thank you, Ms. Hasan.

May I suggest that anyone else who has a statement that would like to get it into the record, if you will write your statement to me in Washington, I will be glad to keep the record open and see that the statement is put into the record.

I wish, again, to thank the final witnesses. They were brief and they cooperated with us, and the audience as well, and with that, and the usual thanks, the meeting is concluded.

[Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned.]

[Material submitted for record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT PRESENTED BY RAUL P. ARREOLA, DIRECTOR, MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION COMMISSION, BOARD OF EDUCATION, CITY OF LOS ANGELES

The Los Angeles Unified School District has a student population which consists of 77 percent minority students. The Other White population is 23 percent, but the curriculum and instruction has been addressed to this 23 percent population. The teacher institutions (colleges and universities) train teachers to teach these students. The standard textbooks and instructional materials are published and address themselves to satisfy the need of the White pupil.

The attitude of teachers, including minority teachers, is to change the minority students into so-called "Americans". Efforts are not made to help the minority student in maintaining and developing his first culture and language. Rather, the minority student's differences are demeaned, either subtly or outright. Current bilingual programs are transitional programs (to assist the student in learning English more quickly so as to move away from their culture and language.

Most minority pupils who come to the United States from other countries arrive here at a very young age and find themselves either in gangs or groups who accept them as they are. Most minority youngsters born here (in the U.S.) experience a difficult time succeeding in a school environment whose attitude is to change him into something that he is not.

The minority student who succeeds and feels adequate about himself is the one who was born in his native country and then educated there to a point where he knows who he is and can acquire the new culture (americanism) and language (English) without jeopardizing his native culture and language. Most of these students feel a self-worth about themselves and succeed in our schools and in our society. These are your true "bilingual/bicultural" citizens who seek and acquire the jobs and fulfill the bilingual needs.

We are having tremendous difficulty in developing bilingual teachers, yet we have the largest potential and bilingual population in Los Angeles. But, the potential is not developed; our transitional programs curtail these student's potential and make them feel inept. Most of our Mexican Americans and very young foreign born youngsters are made to feel unworthy about themselves. They have been stripped of their first culture and language, their potential, and then are forced to acquire a new language to replace their first—they speak neither their native language nor English adequately. No wonder we lack a sufficient number of qualified bilingual teachers.

Many of our teachers and administrators impose their middle-class values on our minority, poor children, and expect our children to possess books and materials which their parents are not able to provide. Many of our children are made to feel ashamed of their (1) neighborhoods; (2) homes; and, (3) parents for being poor and different.

Many of our students feel unworthy and are ashamed of their families—How can this attitude and feeling provide for success?

The state and federal governments must provide for the basics of education: (1) adequate books and proper materials for a quality education; (2) relative criteria for teachers and administrators; (3) proper facilities and curriculum; and, (4) jobs for parents to provide proper housing.

We must take the SHAME and the lack of self-esteem out of our educational environment!

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
NINETY-FIFTH STREET PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 1, 1981.

Hon. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,
29th District, California,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You extended an invitation to attend the Education and Labor Subcommittee Congressional oversight hearing in Los Angeles at the Muses Room of the Museum of Science and Industry on November 6, 1981. I did attend, but I would have preferred to testify to provide your subcommittee with a more balanced input or feedback from a practicing educational professional in a minority community school of Los Angeles. At the end of your hearings, you welcomed those of us to send in additional written testimony to be entered in the congressional record.

The subcommittee under your chairmanship indicated that the full committee was interested in the impact of the present administration budget cuts and the new federal regulations impact upon local school communities. Secondly, the committee was interested in any solution strategy that would make better use of the reduced federal education funds flowing into local education agencies.

As a practicing administrator in a minority school in Los Angeles, we foresee the following negative and destructive impact upon local schools, staffs, students and parents:

1. Reduced quality and quantity of paraprofessionals providing daily reinforcement lessons to small groups of students in each classroom of a Title I school.
2. Reduced quantity and quality of Staff Development Workshops to train teachers, paraprofessionals and parents in teaching procedures and learning activities.
3. Reduced quantity and quality of the school support teams of curriculum coordinators, teacher advisors and resource teachers who teach Title I classroom teachers "how to teach better and manage their classrooms more effectively".
4. Reduced quantity and quality of medical, nursing, counseling and psychological services providing poor Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian and White students, who have very special needs rooted in poverty.
5. Reduced planning and preparation time to improve instruction and learning activities for teachers through after school and Saturday work sessions.
6. Reduced opportunity to create, maintain and replicate effective and outstanding local Title I model schools where teachers and students are achieving the twin goals of improving instruction and learning.
7. Reduced ability to sustain the holding power of keeping very well-trained teachers who were nutured in these Title I minority schools.
8. Reduced quality and quantity of proven Administrative and Management Development training programs for under-achieving minority schools.
9. Reduced quantity and quality of parental involvement in "shared decision-making" in analyzing, designing, maintaining and evaluating local school educational programs.
10. Reduced quantity and quality of parental participation in the daily classroom instruction and learning activities at each Title I minority school.
11. Reduced impact upon local education agency's policies and legislation without an active and participating apparatus of School Advisory Councils, Area Advisory Councils and District Advisory Councils.
12. Reduced employment of students, parents, teachers, administrators and support personnel whose economic impact upon each local community, city and county will be destructive and unhealthy in the long run.
13. Reduced ability and opportunity for the local education agency or governing board to provide the educational infrastructure and educational services needed by a major portion of its educational clients: minority children.

As a practicing administrator in a very special minority school project funded with Title I and local tax levy funds, we are in the midst of improving instruction in three minority schools with the present 1981-82 budget allocation. Most of these improvements could not be effectively implemented without the continued flow of Consolidated Application monies. The following recommendations are some of the solution strategies that should be applied to under-achieving minority schools utilizing limited federal tax levy funds. We are employing the following design variables to improve instruction and learning. These quality assurance components have been validated by the Pre-School longitudinal study, the Madden Early Childhood Education Study in 22 matched schools in California; the two Rand Corp. Studies in 15 Los Angeles Title I Schools, and the Edmonds, Clark & Lotto national study of 1200 schools. It is our recommendation that the funds should be allocated to local education agencies and minority schools to make them more effective if these schools adopt these quality assurance components:

1. *Enrollment ceiling to prevent overcrowding.*—All studies indicated that schools with 600 or less pupils were more effective.
2. *Strong, skilled and motivated leadership of the administrator, principal or superintendent.*—Research studies indicate that humanistic or autocratic administrators must possess the skill, quality and/or charisma to motivate classroom teachers.
3. *High expectations of students, staff and administrators.*—Research studies have consistently reinforced the "Pygmalion impact" of the "self-fulfilling prophesy", i.e., teachers get what they expect from students; and conversely, principals and parents get what they expect from teachers and paraprofessionals.
4. *Selection of teachers by the administrator and/or by parents.*—Recent research studies indicate that when a teacher or an administrator has a "cultural match", or a sense of professional identity with the educational policies of the school, the community and the district, then they are successful with classroom management or with school management.

5. Daily and weekly parental involvement and parental participation.—All four major studies indicate that the number of parents involved is not necessarily significant, but it is the daily or weekly involvement of parents participating in the classroom, the school activities and the shared decisionmaking format that is present in all of the "more effective schools".

6. Small classes and three-hour and six-hour paraprofessionals in each room.—Research studies consistently illustrate that class size is not necessarily significant in student achievement; but because most teachers think that it is, this feeling or attitude is translated into greater student achievement.

Studies also indicate that small classes and the presence of a paraprofessional reduces the pupil to teaching adult ratio at 10 to 1 or 15 to 1. These studies about small classes and student achievement also indicate that the more direct teaching time that is given to students does increase student achievement.

Small classes and the addition of paraprofessionals provide more time on teaching-learning tasks.

7. Needs assessment/analysis process must precede the design of any local school educational program.—All research studies indicate where teachers, grade levels, subject departments use some sort of school-wide or district-wide standardized assessment instruments, such as the LAUSD "Survey of Essential Skills", and/or the "Calif. Test of Basic Skills"; then teachers and schools can identify each student's specific skill needs for instruction and learning.

8. Joint planning of teaching strategies, selection of goals/objectives/skills and learning activities by teachers and administrators.—These same studies also indicate that joint planning and decision-making in curriculum, classroom management and school management were present in the majority of the more effective schools studied.

9. Staff Development Training Workshops for administrators, resource or support personnel, teachers, papaprofessionals parent volunteers on a regular weekly, bimonthly or monthly basis.—Each of these four major research studies found that the more than 1200 "effective schools" had regular staff development training workshops based upon local school-wide, grade level and department needs assessment and analysis. These workshops were jointly planned and conducted by "on-site" teachers and resource personnel. Each of these workshops were followed by a classroom demonstration lesson conducted by a regular classroom teacher.

10. Regular communication and dissemination of information regarding the local school educational programs and needs internally to teachers, paraprofessionals, students; and externally to parents, volunteers, citizens, local organizations, businesses, agencies and school's concentric communities.—Each of the research studies illustrated that the more effective schools had daily and weekly methods of communicating internally and externally with daily and/or weekly student assemblies, grade level, department and faculty meetings; daily and/or weekly newsletters and newspapers, bulletins, and special projects and events.

11. Daily monitoring, evaluation and supervison of instruction in all classrooms by administrators, support personnel, grade level or department chairpersons.—These recent studies also show that when administrators visit all classrooms daily to "sample the quality of instruction"; teaching procedures and learning activities increase the achievement levels of students in these more effective schools.

Research also indicates that when administrators utilize a more in-depth and regular 20- or 40- or 60-minute observation of a classroom and provide teachers and paraprofessionals with a written feedback in a face-to-face conference, teachers do improve their instructional procedures, because this supervision process nurtures a sense of ownership, shared leadership, self-esteem and professional growth.

12. A creative, safe and secure school climate for instruction and learning.—Our studies reinforce consistently that the more effective schools had a climate or setting where students, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents "felt good" about themselves, their school, their educational programs and their personal, as well as, collective achievements.

Such schools were characterized by clean campuses, facilities, classrooms, cafeterias; fewer incidents of personal violence, graffiti and overt verbal abuse.

Their school climates were nurtured by weekly, bi-weekly or monthly school-wide activities or projects, such as, student assemblies, special events, cultural presentations, campus beautification, academic fairs, career awareness, consumer education, environmental projects, etc.

13. Basic subjects such as, Science, Mathematics, English, Language, Reading, Spelling, Writing and Social Studies should be taught daily without any interruptions from any source.—All of the research studies indicated that the more effective schools raised student achievement levels when teachers guarded the teaching of the basic subjects zealously in a "time on task" approach to teaching them.

14. Daily and hourly directed teaching lessons by the teacher and reinforcement lessons by the paraprofessionals in small group instruction rather than large group instruction.—Research has consistently shown that the more time that a student has with "face-to-face" instruction on needed basic skills, their achievement levels were raised in the majority of those over 1200 "more effective schools".

These same studies also indicated that students who participated as a part of "guided practice", follow-up or "independent activities" of the accepted 7-step lesson plan process, learned more effectively whether they had visual, auditory or tactical learning styles.

15. Daily homework assignments reviewed by parents daily and checked by teachers daily.—Our four basic studies also indicated that students who were achieving in these more effective schools were given daily reinforcement projects as part of the homework process.

These same students had a strong sense of what the role of the school was in the nurturing of their coping strategies and survival values of their present and future life.

16. Regular progress reports and parent conferences.—These studies also illustrate that when parents are more aware of the needs and successes of their children, they will participate more fully and regularly in school programs and the educational process of their children. Students feel more confidence about themselves and their classes or schools, when they know they are achieving successfully and that failure is also a part of the learning process.

We recommend maintenance of all Consolidated Application Funding with escalator clauses that may be impacted by a local education agency's population growth, collective bargaining and salary inflation rates. I propose these design and policy items, not just from the provencial setting of our 3 schools project, but also from my global experience in working with staff development and management training in some 231 LAUSD schools, 39 CUSD schools and 17 IUSD schools. If further reduction continues in the education funding sources, these short-sighted policies will have a micro and marco effect on local schools, communities, school districts and each state. It is most unfortunate that the creators of federal education policy decisions and legislations cannot see and feel what they have wrought . . . !

Our nation has benefited from the "seed money" impact of Title I upon the improvement of instruction and learning in the poor Asian, Black, Latino, Indian and White schools of this city, county, state and nation. In short, we need continued and expanded federal funding support to maintain and improve the quality of American Schools. Can you held us . . .?

Sincerely,

ALFRED S. MOORE,
Principal.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1981.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Wednesday, July 1, 1981 I convened a public hearing in my district (7th—Baltimore, Md) on the subject of "The Baltimore City Public Schools—Retention, Drug Trafficking, Proposed Budget Cuts, and Parental Involvement." As you can see by the enclosed program, I heard from a significant number of local experts and persons who have direct impact upon the resolution of problems in these critical areas.

For your perusal I am sharing a copy of those testimonies which were submitted, along with my opening statement. I would very much appreciate your consideration regarding the printing of these proceedings into a comprehensive booklet.

I believe that the information which surfaced during this hearing is quite valuable since the problems revolving around the aforementioned areas are common to most inner city school districts. In that regard, I hope that your Committee could be responsible for consolidating the testimonies thereby making it available for all House and Senate Members.

Please advise me at your earliest convenience and I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PARREN J. MITCHELL.

Enclosure.

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL (D. 7TH-MD.), HEARING ON THE PROBLEMS OF RETENTION, DRUG TRAFFICKING, SPENDING REDUCTIONS IMPACT, AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, JULY 1, 1981

Ladies and Gentlemen. First of all, I would like to welcome you and extend particular thanks to our witnesses. Your very presence today indicates that you share our growing concern with the grave threats to education as precipitated by federal spending reductions in this area.

Unfortunately, our united plight continues during a time when it is apparent that education has become a low priority in the eyes of the new Administration. I seriously question the validity of a federal budget proposal which stipulates that some $12.2 billion in cuts must come from elementary, secondary, vocational, and higher education programs for fiscal years 1981, 1982 and 1983. Moreover, I cringe at the knowledge that the House Education and Labor Committee, through the Budget deliberations, and Reconciliation process, has been forced to almost fully adhere to the proposed cuts by facilitating aggregate outlay reductions of over $11 billion for fiscal year 1982 over $14 billion for fiscal year 1983 and over $18 billion for fiscal year 1984. It should also be noted that the Committee's compliance with the Reconciliation instructions will mean the imposition of spending reductions into fiscal year 1984!

If we examine the implications of the proposed reductions in a matter-of-fact manner, we need not exert any effort to paint a bleak picture. A mere review of the resulting realities is quite enough to propel us into alarm and constructive actions.

It is no secret that the proposed reductions in federal spending for education will reduce services available to poor children, the handicapped, and youth who benefit from skills training programs. Additionally, most states have started to anticipate the possible elimination of funding for school libraries, teacher training, basic skills improvement, Teacher Corps, and special programs such as education of the gifted and talented, consumers' education and career education.

Unfortunately, there is more to this assessment. For example, due to budget reductions in higher education assistance, approximately 575,000 students, primarily from middle-income families, will become ineligible for assistance under the Pell Grant Program. Now we will have these students competing for other educational assistance programs which will also be essentially held at current funding levels.

Looking closely again at federal aid for elementary and secondary education programs, the Administration and many Members of Congress are also proposing to consolidate these activities into two block grants for purposes of implementation. Now, regardless of how any of us perceive block grants, I do not believe that a person in this room is confident that our lower income and minority students will be well served by entrusting the states and local educational agencies with the sole responsibility of administering these programs. In fact, even the most conservative among us question the cost of the block grant approach and the subsequent chaos which may result as states exerise sole discretion in choosing among the dispensation of funds which have been cut by 25 percent.

Let us look for a moment at Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act monies. As you know, under the auspices of this Act, support is provided for programs of compensatory education designed to increase the educational attainment of children from low-income families. The Administration's wishes, and possible Congressional endorsement of the block grant concept in this area will mean that, in the absence of federal monitoring and guidelines, these Title I monies will be opened to disputes by various local education groups. I shudder to think that such disputes, in the absence of targeting, as defined by currently acceptable standards, could mean that many children will be underserved or not served at all. I believe we must seriously consider the block grant approach and realize that the Congress may produce the concept devoid of prevailing federal rules and regulations, and eager to rely on local jurisdictions to develop alternative guidelines for implementation.

While the capacity of our local entities to pursue such activities is not highly questionable, we must wonder about special targeting and actual program responsiveness during the period in which the development of new guidelines is taking place. Moreover, there is always the underlying fear that such program funds could certainly be used to boost fiscal stability in ways other than meeting the needs of our disadvantaged students. I oppose the block granting of Title I ESEA or any other programs, and I urge you to consider the implications of this approach.

On the positive side, future budget deliberations allow us some slight hope that we can forestall or reduce the size of the projected fiscal year 1983 and 1984 federal budget cuts. Contrary to our feelings of dismay about the highly unprecedented budget procedures of late, full review of the proposed fiscal year 1983 and 1984 budget cuts is a mandate of the 1974 Congressional Budget Act. We can form the foundation to combat the projected cuts by clearly setting forth the impact of the fiscal year 1982 budget cuts on Public Education. The consolidation of potential efforts in this very room can comprise a viable barrier to a repetition of this year's penny-wise, pound foolish approach to solving problems of the economy.

A very feasible approach is to focus on several universal problem areas in public education and examine the impact of the budget cuts on these areas. For example, the problems of Retention and Drug Trafficking are quite common, particularly in our urban areas. I believe our experts today will reiterate the critical need for adequate federal funding, even with 100 percent participation from the types of community resources represented here.

An initial step is to analyze the feasibility and effectiveness of exising programs to address these problems. Step two would involve the investigation of whether federal funds either directly or indirectly aid in combating school drop-out occurrence and drug trafficking. I know we can safely assume that experts today will substantiate the need for progressive preventive approaches versus the mere treatment of the problems once they are identified. Adequate funding for these approaches is imperative—elementary school counselors cannot always work on a voluntary basis, nor can we expect such initiatives as project D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Reduction Through Education) to operate at maximum capacity in the absence of sufficient monies.

Needed finally is an assessment of what specific impact the fiscal year 1982 and subsequent budget cuts will have on federal and local efforts to combat both activities. Extracting from the positive nature of cost-effectiveness, this same kind of critical evaluation must be targeted to include impact analyses for ensuing fiscal years. Such assessments are not impossible this year since our Congressional Committees have projected particular budget reductions through 1984.

It is particularly imperative that such analyses are not limited to our educators, educational administrators, or human services coordinators. Perhaps the most critical question that all community segments should ask themselves is, "What can our establishment do to address prevailing public school problems?" Again, not one of us should be immuned from being asked and more importantly, from responding to this question. For as much as we must examine the impact of the loss of federal funds, our top priority must become what we can do as a united, concerned community.

I am very proud to see the cross-section of concerned community leaders present today. I am encouraged by the apparent desire to hold other segments, besides the education component, accountable for the adequacy of our public schools. However, it is sad that our businesses, community organizations, and other groups whose activities are not related directly to education, are shocked at the reality that they must be prepared to absorb the challenge of decreased federal funds for education. I submit that such a responsibility should have been well established and should not even be a reaction to budget cuts.

In all fairness, I have to acknowledge that many businesses and community organizations have played key roles in the educational development of our children. We are all familiar with instances where such groups have stepped out of their specific roles and have extended their resources to provide essentail programs in the area of education. In fact, we will hear from shining examples of such actions today. The point is that these activities must become the norm. The undergirding of educational pursuits for our children must become priority with all community residents. For the businesses, there will be no employees, advisors, or informed consumers without education. For the community organizations, the essential future of tomorrow (our children) will not survive without a firm educational base. For our elected officials we cannot count on future generations to protect the interests of this city and state unless we protect adequate educational facilities, programs, and opportunities for those who must lead in the future.

I do not want to fear the onslaught of total state and local control for program implementation in education or any other area. It is very difficult to oppose the concept of block grants when, theoretically, the core of this approach is that the immediate community is in the best position to assess its own needs and provide the pertinent services accordingly. The assessment of these needs still does not worry me as much as the fact that prior to the imposition of federal regulations, guidelines, and targeting, many of our human needs program recipients were victims of discrimination, underservice, and irresponsiveness.

We are in a position today, and in the future, to guarantee the soundness and responsiveness of public education facilities. The drastic curtailment of federal assistance should not mean the automatic demise of programs to combat Drug Trafficking, Drop-out acceleration, and academic ineptness. Such reductions should mean that our ongoing efforts will just have to work more arduously.

I will continue in my fight against the prevailing economic approaches as embodied in our formal budget targets for fiscal years 1982 through 1984. I will never encourage acceptance of the feasibility of such approaches as I do not believe that they will guarantee equitability for all citizens or even minimal access for many. I do believe, however, that we must face the enactment of the Administration's dreams as a reality, and respond as a united front. This response must be a continued effort to combat the apparent insensitivity. At the same time, the response must include a concerted, pragmatic approach by the organizations represented here to assure that our community will guarantee the continued life of public education.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. NEWMAN, LIEUTENANT, BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT, BALTIMORE, MD., CONCERNING DRUG TRAFFICKING IN BALTIMORE CITY, JULY 1, 1978

Drug abuse pervades the American way of life. Conservative estimates indicate that at least 42 million Americans have experimented with Marijuana, smoking approximately 130,000 pounds daily. The use and abuse of other Controlled Dangerous Substances is also increasing at an alarming rate. Not only are a large number of our citizens using drugs, but the age of initial experimentation is declining. More and more, our school children are coming in contact with drugs. A recent survey conducted by the Maryland Drug Abuse Administration indicated that 8th grade students are exposed to and have used many drugs, including the most dangerous, Heroin. The following was obtained from this survey: 36.1 percent of 8th graders, 63.3 percent of 10th graders and 69 percent of 12th graders have used Marijuana. The presence of Cocaine in the school system is indicated by the following: 3.7 percent of 8th graders, 7.4 percent of 10 graders and 12.5 percent of 12th graders have used it. Although not in the top three as to volume of use, Phencyclidine (PCP) should be of grave concern to all of us. PCP, which is a mind altering drug, is extremely dangerous due to its ability to provide psychosis closely akin to schizophrenia, which can occur after only one dose, and which can last and recur long after the drug is out of the system. The use of PCP has been discovered in the eighth through the twelfth grades. In 1978, of 915 twelfth graders surveyed, 13.2 percent admitted using PCP; out of 1,123 tenth graders surveyed, 8.1, percent had used PCP and out of 933 eighth graders surveyed, 3.4 percent had some contact with PCP. Although this survey was conducted in the Baltimore City Public Schools, comparable results would also be discovered in the private schools in our community. This overview of the drug involvement of our youth gives us an indication of the seriousness of the problem. We must combine our resourses and attack this problem at every level if we are to be successful.

The Baltimore Police Department recognizes that the solution to the problem of drug abuse does not lie in punishment or treatment, but rather in education and prevention before the fact. The Criminal Justice System cannot resolve the drug problem by itself, it must seek support from others. For example, the narcotic arrests for the Police Department has increased over 200 percent in the past ten (10) years, and yet drug abuse has continued to rise.

Our schools and teachers provides a needed ally to assist in this endeavor. Through an educational program presented to students, the school can provide the information necessary to consider alternatives to drug abuse, and play a paramount role in shaping community attitudes and hopefully curbing drug usage. WE in the Baltimore Police Department are involved in such a program. Project D.A.R.E.

It is a rather general agreement among Law Enforcement experts that there is a direct correlation between Drug Abuse and Crime. In order for a Narcotic Addict to support a $100 per day drug habit, this individual must obtain $36,500 a year just for Narcotics. Since it is almost impossible for an addict to make this amount of money legally, he must resort to criminal activity. This activity has been found to include Theft, Robbery and Burglary. Since the going rate for the conversion of stolen property is $1 for $3 value, an addict must steal over $100,000 worth of goods per year if he is to support his addiction through property crimes. This is an example of how criminality is rampant among addicts. It is evident that addicts are responsible for committing an inordinate amount of crime and that many of these offenses are serious in nature. These observations were proven by Dr. David N. Nurco of the University of Maryland, who participated in the publication of a paper on October 9, 1980. "The Criminality of Heroin Addicts When Addicted and When Off Opiates" interviewed 237 Heroin Addicts from Baltimore City, and it was determined that these individuals were responsible for approximately 500,000 crimes over an eleven (11) year period. This study showed the opiate use itself was the principal cause of the high crime rate among addicts, so, if we can control addiction, we can reduce criminality appreciably. In order to achieve this objective, the Baltimore Police Department has developed the "Total Officer" concept. Under this concept, all levels of narcotic enforcement, other than the major suppliers, are conducted by officers of the field force. The major violators are investigated by the Narcotic Unit. As a result of this policy, every member of the Department is trained in narcotic identification and detection and is actively encouraged to become involved in narcotic investigations.

Another method employed to reduce the crime committed by addicts are periodic special operations which concentrate on selected areas of the city that have shown a high increase in narcotic use. Officers from the various Police Districts throughout the City are joined in a Task Force concept and concentrate on Narcotic Violations. The most recent operation was concluded on 5 June 1981 resulting in the arrest of 1,184 persons and the recovery of 104 firearms.

All our efforts locally can only deal with demand reduction, but this is not the ultimate solution. Attacking and eliminating the source is the only effective way of dealing with the problem. Therefore, there are certain measures that must be taken on the Federal Government level to insure our success in dealing with the Narcotic Problem.

Since the drug problem is so pervasive and the most serious internal threat we face today, we should mobilize all of our available reserves to assist in this endeavor. All authorities appear to be unanimous in their estimates that only 5 percent of the illegal flow of drugs into this country are diverted and confiscated by law enforcement before reaching the domestic market. Legislation has been introduced by Senator Sam Nunn, (D.-Ga.) and Representative Billy Lee Evans (D.-Ga.) that would enable all branches of the Armed Services to assist with intelligence gathering. This could be accomplished, and not deter the Military from their primary mission. This amendment to the Posse Comitatus Act would enable the United States Navy and Air Force to supplement an overextended Coast Guard and Customs Service in the detection of narcotics coming into this country from foreign sources. Dramatic results could be anticipated, as the vast majority of illegal substances coming into the country are transported by sea and air.

Secondly, the amount of marijuana produced is so large, the number of people involved is so great, and the profit margin is so high, that without an eradication program which strikes at the source, the end will never be in sight. We ask that the Federal Government aggressively support an eradication program that was so successful in Mexico a number of years ago. Marijuana is bad, and we would like to see an all-inclusive effort to diminish and hopefully eliminate it in the foreseeable future, lest its usage become as widespread and as injurious to the health as alcohol and tobacco. Since studies by the National Institute of Drug Abuse (N.I.D.A.) have indicated an ever increasing and alarming rate of use by adolescents 12 through 17 years of age, it is imperative that we make these initiatives immediately.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from Police Commissioner Donald D. Pomerleau's testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice on September 11, 1979, "I would ask you to consider the thesis that Federal, State and local law enforcement are, along with the judiciary, the most effective tools we have at the present time; while, in fact, that which we represent should be needed the least. However, harsh reality indicated that unless the Congress, the Department of State and Health, Education and Welfare work cooperatively to identify, develop, support and implement progressive programs of growth control and demand reduction we will be no further ahead tomorrow than we were yesterday."

Since drug usage cuts across economic, social, ethnic and racial lines, we all have the potential to be affected. Recognizing the wide spectrum of drug abuse, we must all unite in combating this deadly opponent.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE GREATER BALTIMORE COMMITTEE, BALTIMORE'S ADOPT-A-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Baltimore's Adopt-A-School Program is business-school partnerships designed to introduce elementary, middle and junior high students to the world of work. The purpose is to help young people appreciate the importance of a good education and its relationship to the world of work.

"School is a certain kind of environment: individualistic, oriented toward cognitive achievement, imposing dependency on and withholding authority and responsibility from those in the role of students. So long as school was short, and merely a supplement of the main activities of growing up, this mattered little. But school has expanded to fill the time that other activities once occupied, without substituting for them."[1]

For five years Baltimore businesses have been helping Baltimore City Public School faculty convince students that the skills and habits stressed in school cannot be passed off as "unimportant kid stuff." Every student, whatever his or her ability and motivation, at times feels bored and frustrated with school. At those times, while the regular school faculty often encounter considerable difficulty cutting through the apathy, variety can prove miraculously effective: variety in speaker and in type of message. When representatives of the business community tell Baltimore City Public School students that they will not be able to find jobs without school diplomas or without being able to read, write or compute, the students hear them. When employees of Baltimore's businesses warn students that people who fail to come to work every day or who arrive late risk losing the opportunity to be promoted and even the chance to work, the students listen. Students need to be told that supervisors can seem every bit as arbitrary and difficult as teachers, and fellow workers every bit as irritating as classmates.

The goal of the Adopt-A-School Program is to motivate students to behave appropriately at school, to attend school regularly, to be punctual, to learn to read, write and compute, to learn to be responsible, and to learn the work constructively with supervisors and peers by (1) showing students the connection between their present lives as students and their futures as working adults, and (2) increasing the exposure of students to principals, teachers, students, and business personnel. This general goal can be broken down into 13 specific aims. Three of these aims refer directly to bridging the school-work gap, six are behavioral objectives, and four can be categorized as academic.

Bridging the school-work gap

1. To establish interaction between business and schools.
2. To expose students to the adult work world.
3. To show students the connections between school and work.

Behavorial objectives

4. To motivate students to learn to cooperate with peers.
5. To motivate students to learn to cooperate with supervisors (i.e. teachers).
6. To motivate students to accept responsibility.
7. To motivate students to be punctual.
8. To motivate students to attend school regularly and to graduate.
9. To motivate students to behave appropriately at school.

Academic objectives

10. To motivate students to learn to use standard English (both spoken and written).
11. To motivate students to learn to compute.
12. To motivate students to learn to write.
13. To motivate students to learn to read.

Each Adopt-A-School partnership develops its own approach to motivating students based on the needs of the school and the resources of the business. Data indicate that the Program has had a significant impact on both academic achievement and attendance. Teachers testify to the effect of the program on students' attitudes. Exposure to the Program helps students develop more positive attitudes towards adults.

In May, 1981 WCAU-TV in Philadelphia sent a crew to do a story on Baltimore's Adopt-A-School Program. The sixth grade students whom they interviewed (out of the presence of either school faculty or business personnel) described the value of the program. One student said she had not understood the relevance of arithmetic skills before her exposure to Adopt-A-School. Another proudly told of the perfect school attendance he maintained when part of Adopt-A-School.

---

[1] Coleman, James S. *et al. Youth: Transition to Adulthood: Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee;* University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London: 1974.

Adopt-a-school partners

American Health and Life Ins. Co.	Chinquapin Middle School
A. S. Bell Co.	Bay-Brook Elementary School
Baltimore Life Insurance Co.	Eutaw-Marshburn Elementary School
Baltimore Federal Savings & Loan	Tench Tilghman Elementary School
Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Diggs Johnson Junior High School
Central Savings Bank	Medfield Heights Elementary School
Charles H. Steffey, Inc.	Hamilton Elementary School
C&P Telephone Co.	Guilford Elementary School
Coopers & Lybrand	Federal Hill Elementary School
First National Bank of Maryland	Dallas F. Nicholas, Senior Elementary School
Hess Shoes	West Baltimore Middle School
Koppers Co.	George Washington Elementary School
Loyola Federal Savings & Loan Association	Mount Royal School
McCormick & Co.	Hampstead Hill Junior High School
Mercantile Bank & Trust Co.	Pimlico Elementary School
Noxell Corp.	Robert Poole Junior High School
Savings Bank of Baltimore	Greenspring Junior High School
United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co.	Booker T. Washington Junior High
Waverly Press	Harford Heights Elementary School
Western Electric Co.	Canton Junior High School
Westinghouse Defense and Electronic Systems Center	Francis Scott Key Junior High

OTHER BUSINESS-SCHOOL COLLABORATION

While the Adopt-A-School Program is the only educational program sponsored by the Greater Baltimore Committee, Baltimore businesses are involved in Baltimore City Public Schools in a host of other ways. For example, many businesses participate in Project Go, a program operated by the Baltimore City Public Schools with goals similar to those of the Adopt-A-School Program. The Voluntary Council on Equal Opportunity sponsors both Engineering Pipeline and Project Excellence. Engineering Pipeline consists of engineering clubs in middle schools or high schools designed to encourage minorities and women to pursue engineering careers. Project Excellence is a summer jobs program for disadvantaged young people who are excellent students. The purpose of Project Excellence is not merely to provide summer jobs but also to demonstrate to the business community that disadvantaged is not synonymous with poor student.

The Ramsey Conference Group is a coalition of administrators from the Baltimore City Public Schools and business executives who seek to use expertise from the business community to help solve school problems. In addition to tackling problems of budget, data processing, purchase order management, transportation and public relations, the group has considered the preparation of Baltimore City Public School students for employment. The Ramsey Conference Group has divided employability into 2 parts: (1) preparation in vocational skills, and (2) whole person training. Whole person training is of greater relevance to our purpose this afternoon. Whole person training refers to the fact that many people cannot find or hold jobs in spite of having adequate vocational skills. These people lack the attitudes and habits that business requires of its workers. The Ramsey Conference Group has catalogued what those attitudes and habits are and is working with the schools to find ways that schools can better help students to develop those attitudes and habits.

Finally, Baltimore businesses are also involved with the Baltimore City Public Schools through the Council on Economic Education, Junior Achievement, vocational education advisory committees, and a host of miscellaneous relationships.

Baltimore business needs to, and is working on, doing more.

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baltimore, Md., June 22, 1981.

To: Hon. Parren J. Mitchell.
From: Percy V. Williams.
Subject: Impact Statement.

Attached is a copy of the Impact Statement prepared by David W. Hornbeck, State Superintendent of Schools, Maryland State Department of Education. While this statement was prepared earlier during the year, there is still too much uncertainty.

Attachment.

STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF PROPOSED FEDERAL RESCISSIONS AND BUDGET CUTS

(Maryland State Department of Education, David W. Hornbeck, State Superintendent of Schools)

The recommendations in the Reagan Economic Plan for the revised fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1982 budget for education will place critical hardships on Maryland's State and local programs in the 1981-82 school year. Moreover, the burden falls disproportionally on the poor, disadvantaged, and handicapped. The rescissions to the fiscal year 1981 continuing resolution average approximately 25 percent, while proposed cuts go as high as 67 percent and 100 percent (fiscal year 1982 budget) in certain programs. These cuts, coupled with a double-digit inflation rate, translate to a 35-40 percent real cut. The total loss to the 750,000 school children of Maryland for the school year beginning in September will exceed $75,000,000.

The rescission proposal becomes even more onerous when it is realized that the forward-funding concept of education, while designed to help schools plan for the coming year, now has become the nemesis. Forward funding was included in the legislation so that schools would know up to a year ahead of time how much money they would receive in grant money and be able to plan accordingly. Forward-funding has now become a mechanism for the Administration to cut funds which, while appropriated, have not yet flown from the federal government to the states and locals. Yet, it is the amount in the fiscal year 1981 continuing resolution on which states and local agencies have based their planning and budgets for fiscal year 1982.

Deregulation, block grants, and resulting savings are suggested as tradeoffs for the proposed cuts. Setting aside for the moment whether those savings are real or imagined, there is no proposal to have such deregulation or block grants accompany the fiscal year 1981 rescission proposals. Thus the same administrative and regulatory burdens will have to be carried with fewer dollars.

As to the merits of deregulation and block grants producing savings, it could be reasonably argued such moves would eliminate a need for appropriations in excess of the fiscal year 1981 appropriation level. But no one should be under the illusion that cuts beyond that in any program will do other than cut directly into the bone of efforts to serve the poor, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped. No amount of rhetoric will alter that fact.

Block grants accompanied by significant cuts will not just result in the elimination of programs. Another phenomenon will occur which may in the long term be equally or more damaging. That phenomenon will be the tearing of a fundamental piece of the fabric of our society when the poor and the handicapped begin to fight with one another for the reduced funds in cities and communities across our state.

In addition to the reduction and/or elimination of services to children, the rescissions and cuts will have other short and long-term consequences. They will result in the layoff of several thousand staff at both local and state level. That loss in income will hardly assist the economy. Those same staff will then receive unemployment compensation thus placing an additional fiscal burden on local school systems. The ripple effect of such consequences will be far reaching.

In the long term, it is difficult to calculate today the impact of the proposed cuts. What we do know is that the juvenile training institutions, prisons and welfare rolls are filled with those who have not succeeded educationally. One may be sure that we will pay whether today or tomorrow.

Until the Administration releases the plan for implementing the proposed block grants, it is impossible to fully measure their impact. We do feel quite strongly, however, that the block grants discussed so far have a major, serious, flaw. At the local level, without any kinds of setasides or percentages to assure program spending in areas of greatest need, there would arise a constant battle over which programs or which kinds of students will receive funding, since all programs could not be maintained. The principal loser in this situation is the child.

When the block grant proposal is released, we will attempt to analyze its impact and measure its workability. In the meantime, we can only offer some suggested criteria for consolidation plans that would improve the administration of federal education funds: (1) Assurance that basic services are provided to special needs populations and that programs are targeted by need; (2) consolidation only of similar programs, with similar structures; and (3) simplification of administrative requirements.

A brief summary of the impact of a 25-percent decrease: Vast reductions of numbers of children served; significant reduction of staff, both state and local; shift at State Education Agency level from technical assistance to improve program quality to monitoring and enforcement role; and reduction or elimination of projects now coming to fruition in fourth and fifth years.

In addition of elementary and secondary education, another very important effort will be severely damaged by the Administration's proposals. That is vocational rehabilitation. Vocational rehabilitation is an 80-20 federally funded program in Maryland. Those proportions have existed for years. We stand to lose more than ⅓ of the federal fund under the President's proposals if vocational rehabilitation gets it pro rata share of the block grant. That block grant also includes the very significant Title XX Social Services funds administered by the Departament of Human Resources. Last year more than 20,000 handicapped adults were admitted to the vocational rehabilitation program. More than 6,500 handicapped adults completed their rehabilitation program. The proposed cuts will impact dramatically on our ability to serve this population as we will have to lay off 200 or more counselors, evaluators, trainers, and others and/or close the important Maryland Rehabilitation Center.

IMPACT SPECIFICS/PROPOSED FEDERAL RESCISSIONS AND BUDGET CUTS

The combination of cuts in this year's budget (fiscal year 1981 rescissions) and proposed cuts for next year (fiscal year 1982) will exceed $75 million.

Children most severely impacted will be those in programs for the disadvantaged (25.3 percent), handicapped children (25.4 percent), and child nutrition programs (40.1 percent).

Library services to 10,000 blind and physically handicapped will be substantially cut.

At least 3,000 state and local employees will be laid off.

Services to 10,000 disadvantaged 5th and 6th graders will be eliminated.

An estimated 160,000 children who now pay for school lunch will stop buying it.

Services to 25,000 handicapped children would be curtailed.

To accommodate proposed cuts in fiscal year 1982, the vocational rehabilitation program would have the choice of virtually gutting its counseling program to handicapped people or closing down the vital Maryland Rehabilitation Center.

Proposed elimination of the Impact Aid program translates into increases in property tax rates of up to 35 cents in 15 Maryland subdivisions.

Other programs seriously hurt by the proposed cuts are vocational education, library services, adult education, equal opportunity, special projects to support state educational priorities (including basic skills), and youth employability.

ESEA Title I—Services to Disadvantaged Children

Amount of State allocation:	
Maryland fiscal year 1982 (continuing resolution)	$49,502,541
Maryland fiscal year 1982 (revised budget)	36,956,790
Loss (25.3 percent)	12,545,751

Impact at local level—report from 22 of 24 LEAs

Children served.—Services to approximately 10,000 children will be discontinued by: (a) eliminating services for grades 5 and 6, and secondary, or (b) eliminating all services in some schools.

Staff eliminations.—1,100 positions affected.

Teachers	102
Aides	710
Parent liaison people	116
Supporting specialists	13
Health services personnel	2
Administrator	1
Unspecified staff	83
Teacher assistants	73

Parent participation curtailed.—Some LEAs report eliminating parent observation programs, reducing Parent Advisory Council budgets, etc.

Severe problems in contract negotiations. Deadlines for lay-off notification are approaching. In some cases, re-negotiation would be necessary, adding costs to local agencies.

Impact at state level

Reduction of two staff members.

A significant shift must be made from providing technical assistance to LEAs to dealing only with monitoring and enforcement and issues of compliance. Program quality will be adversely affected.

Major Accomplishments to Date

In grades 2-6, all but one school system now have more than 50 percent of students achieving ten months growth for a year's instruction in reading and math; in some cases, above 60 percent.

Parent involvement has grown considerably and is a model for other states.

Instructional programs are specifically developed to meet needs of Title I students.

Education for the handicapped

Amount of State Allocation (4 programs):	
Maryland fiscal year 1982 (continuing resolution)	$25,268,000
Maryland fiscal year 1982 (revised budget)	18,859,000
Loss (25.4 percent)	6,409,000

Impact at local level (state grants)

Reduction of services to approximately 25,000 handicapped children.

In reports from 8 LEAs, 94 professional positions and 50 support positions would be eliminated.

Grants for local level inservice training, which is mandated by the regulations, would be eliminated.

Compliance will be difficult because of specificity of regulations—especially in full educational opportunity, Child Find, inservice training, procedural safeguards, and complaint procedures.

Local school systems are currently renegotiating teacher contracts. Funding rescissions will further compound problems resulting from limited resources.

NB—Maryland law was written to parallel Public Law 94-142, any changes in federal regulations to ease the requirements have little or no impact in Maryland.

Impact at State level (State grants)

Five or more professional positions will be eliminated.

Drastic reductions in the state's ability to provide technical assistance to LEAs and to monitor and evaluate special education programs.

Other programs

1. *Preschool incentive.*—Loss of $132,000 (25.1 percent). Will result in reduction in quality or complete elimination of special education and related services to 5,000 handicapped preschoolers. Increased state and local contributions will be required to maintain services. Costlier, more restrictive environments will be required for these students in later years.

2. *Special education personnel development.*—Loss of $170,000. The entire grant will be eliminated because Maryland is a Z cycle state which is due for renewed funding in fiscal year 1982. All Z cycle states will be denied funding while X and Y cycle states will be funded. The elimination of this grant impacts the quality of special education and related services to approximately 100,000 handicapped children. All state level training will be eliminated. Two staff positions at the state level will be eliminated.

3. *ESEA Title I, handicapped.*—Loss of $793,000 (25.5 percent) Reduction in the quality of special education and related services for 3,800 severely handicapped children in state operated/state supported institutions and locally operated programs. Quality of life will be diminished as supplemental services are cut. At MSDE, two staff positions are affected as well as significant impact at DHMH. Compliance will be affected in ability to provide supplementary services as required by the regulations.

Major accomplishments to date

Production of a 16-part TV training series with accompanying instructor's manual and participant activities for inservice teachers of secondary level handicapped students.

Expansion of special education and related services to 600 handicapped infants ages birth through two.

Development of identification models for LD students.

Expansion of related services and vocational education services to the handicapped.

Development and piloting of the Program Evaluation Models.

The deinstitutionalization of approximaely 2,480 severely handicapped children.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amount of State allocation	Fiscal year 1981	Fiscal year 1982
Basic support	$12,790,000	[1] $9,593,000
Social Security Disability Income (SSDI)	1,168,162	0
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	553,151	0
Total	14,511,313	9,593,000

Note: Loss $4,918,313 (33.9 percent)

[1] Funds for fiscal year 1982 are included with a number of other programs in a Social Services block grant to be administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Four critical problems affect services to handicapped adults in vocational rehabilitation.

1. Reductions of 25 percent of basic support make it impossible to continue to provide the same level of direct services to clients.
2. Inclusion in a block grant administered by the Department of Health and Human Services would not ensure levels of support that now exist with categorical funds. Rehabilitation would compete with other social services programs such as Child Welfare, Foster Care, Title XX Social Security, and Developmental Disabilities for funds.
3. Elimination of the Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Rehabilitation programs, (special federal funds provided to vocational rehabilitation agencies to serve the severely disabled population) will result in a significant loss of services. In fiscal year 1981, the Division received $1,721,313 to serve these persons.
4. Under the block grant proposal, federal funds provided for training of rehabilitation personnel and for special grant projects (Independent Living, Client Assistance Project, and similar special services) would be eliminated and support for such projects would have to be eliminated provided under a reduced basic grant.

Impact at the local level

No real impact—a state program.

Impact at the State level

Critical decisions will need to be made concerning options to substantially reduce field programs while maintaining some program quality. In addition, serious consideration will have to be given to reducing or eliminating service components at the Maryland Rehabilitation Center.

Substantial reductions would be required in those federal funded rehabilitation programs previously supported through individual grants. Areas affected would include professional training services, advocacy services for clients provided by the Client Assistance Project, and the Independent Living Center Project.

Vocational rehabilitation is an 80-20 federally funded program in Maryland. Those proportions have existed for years. We stand to lose more than one-third of the federal funds under the Administrations proposals if vocational rehabilitation gets its pro-rate share of the block grant. Folded into the proposed block grant is the very significant Title XX Social Services funds administered by the Department of Human Resources.

The proposed cuts will have a devastating effect on our ability to serve our clients, as we will have to lay off 200 or more counselors, evaluators, trainers, and others, and/or close the vital Maryland Rehabilitation Center.

Major accomplishments to date

Last year more than 20,000 handicapped adults were admitted to the vocational rehabilitation program. More than 6,500 completed their rehabilitation programs.

Child Nutrition Programs

Amount of State allocation:	
Maryland fiscal year 1981 (this program is not forward funded. No rescissions)	$65,904,992
Maryland fiscal year 1982 (Administration Budget)	39,451,248
Loss (40.1 percent)	26,453,744
Impact on local level:	
Eliminates the support for paid meals:	
Lunches (schools and institutions)	42,131,618
Breakfasts (schools and institutions)	1,235,963
Lunches and suppers (child care centers)	474,263
Breakfasts (child care centers)	286,584
Reduces the support for reduced price meals:	
Lunches (schools and institutions)	5,737,595
Breakfasts (schools and institutions)	875,570
Lunches and suppers (child care centers)	315,629
Breakfasts (child care centers)	222,147
Changes the guidelines for eligibility for reduced price meals from 195 percent of poverty level to 185 percent and eliminates standard deduction:	
Lunches (schools and institutions)	819,656
Breakfasts (schools and institutions)	125,081
Lunches and suppers (child care centers)	45,090
Breakfasts (child care centers)	31,735
Reduces funds for all lunches: Lunches (schools and institutions)	23,702,498
Eliminates sponsors with tuition above $1,500.	
Eliminates the support for snacks: Snacks (child care centers)	3,136,456
Reduces cash-in-lieu of commodities:	
Paid lunches and suppers (child care centers)	474,263
Reduced lunches and suppers (child care centers)	360,719
Eliminates support for a la carte milk where other meals are served: Servings (schools and institutions)	32,162,167

Eliminates the Summer Food Service Program; 1,275,461 meals (recreation centers, summer camps, etc.).

Eliminates the Nutrition Education and Training Program; 17 projects (schools, institutions, and child care centers).

Eliminates the Food Service Equipment Assistance Program; funds to purchase equipment (schools, institutions, and child care centers).

Eliminates the update of poverty guidelines.

Changes semi-annual adjustment of rates to annual.

Requires the verification of income for a sample of the applicants.

Impact at the State Level.—No impact at the State level.

Summary of losses

School lunch program	$12,490,647
Food distribution program	8,647,894
School breakfast program	429,705
Child care food program	1,116,414
Summer food service program	1,569,774
Nutrition education and training program	264,421
Food service equipment assistance program	326,781
Special milk program	1,608,108
State loss	26,453,744

Vocational education

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$13,417,251
1982 (revised budget)	10,349,126
Loss	3,068,125

Impact at the local level

Grants to community colleges on the Eastern Shore for programs to serve displaced homemakers cannot reach fruition.

Support teams in the rural and target low tax-yield counties will not be funded for disadvantaged and handicapped vocational students.

Only 12 of 24 local districts and 6 of 17 community colleges can be funded for providing placement services (program placement, job placement, and follow-up of graduates) to vocational students.

The user fee for occupational information updating services for 300 secondary schools and 12 community colleges will be adversely affected.

Equal access attempts for minorities, handicapped, disadvantaged, and females will diminish because of the lack of funding for extended-day, short-term, and summer programs in at least 12 counties.

Impact at the State level

The loss of two state persons for evaluation and Office of Civil Rights review and on-site visits, will not permit the State of Maryland to be in compliance with the P.L. 94-482 assurance requirements.

The technical assistance and on-site compliance review phases of the program to comply with the Office for Civil Rights Guidelines dealing with equity will be virtually eliminated in the first instance and adversely affected in the second.

The state will only be able to allot special disadvantaged funds to one subdivision (Baltimore City); two others of equal rank, Somerset and Garrett Counties, will be unable to provide work study to disadvantaged students.

The requirements for supporting a Management Information System cannot be met except on a prorated basis. This method has been ruled inadequate by the U.S. Department of Education, Vocational Education Office.

Maryland competency-based research and development activities will cease. Approximately 60 percent of the occupational programs still have to be analyzed for output standards (competencies).

The schedule development of an automated equipment inventory and facility utilization system will be delayed, resulting in continuation of the mechanical processes at state and local levels.

Major accomplishments

Competency-based vocational-technical criteria have been developed for 40 percent of all school-based occupational programs in the State of Maryland.

To date, 41.8 percent of all enrolled 10th to 12th grade students are being served in occupational programs.

A total of 1,300 of the state's 2,000 secondary programs have been presently evaluated to determine the level of program operation, support services, and community/school activities.

Formal agreements have been signed by five community colleges and their corresponding local education agencies to practice articulation of occupational programs.

Impact aid (Public Law 81-874)

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1981 (continuing resolution—90 percent of entitlement)	$17,867,700
1982 (Administration budget)	....
Loss: (100 percent)	17,867,700

Impact at the local level

In fiscal year 1982 budget recommendations, only heavily impacted "A" districts (where over 20 percent of students have parents who both live and work on federal property). Nationally, eligibility is reduced from 4,300 to 330 districts. In Maryland, because of large local districts, no district is eligible.

Most local fiscal year 1982 budgets have already been finalized; local funds will have to compensate for this loss through tax increases. This is an entitlement program—to give general aid to LEAs to compensate for loss of local tax revenue due to presence of federal property.

The loss of Impact Aid would cause increases in property tax rates in 15 Maryland subdivisions ranging up to 35¢ per $100 of real property. This increase represented as a percentage will effect property tax rate changes ranging up to 17.5 percent. If on the other hand this money is not replaced, services to poor, disadvantaged, handicapped and average children will be seriously affected.

Impact at the State level.—No real impact, since payments are made directly to LEAs.

ESEA Title IV-C—Local innovation

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1981	$2,798,000
1982 (continuing resolution)	1,695,000
1982 (revised budget)	927,000
Loss: (1981-82) (66.9 percent)	1,871,000

Impact at local level

About 188,000 students would lose some or all service.

Approximately 140 project staff positions would be terminated.

Over 9,000 teachers would lose present inservice and staff development services.

Two-thirds of existing programs would be eliminated. A 67 percent reduction in one year causes serious disruption in the operation of the projects.

LEAs would not have any available federal funds for designing and implementing projects which address critical local educational problems. (Title IV-C is the only federal program designed to provide these funds).

Some Title IV-C projects will be eliminated just at the point when they are ready to demonstrate effectiveness resulting in loss of several years of preparation and development.

Impact at State level

Elimination of two staff positions.

Reduction in the number of projects supporting State Board of Education priorities such as basic skills, gifted and talented, alternative education programs, guidance and counseling, and early childhood education.

Major accomplishments

Model programs have been designed and implemented by LEAs in Early Childhood Education, Alternative Education for Disruptive students, and in the Education for the Gifted and Talented which significantly influenced the direction of education throughout the state.

LEAs have been provided the opportunity to explore different alternatives in solving some crucial local educational problems.

Diverse models have been developed for serving the needs of children with a wide variety of handicapping conditions.

Improved project focus and management has resulted in a significantly higher rate of LEAs continuation/installation after termination of federal funds. These programs have significantly impacted on LEAs; e.g., Proficiency Instruction and Curriculum Development now adopted as local board policy in an LEA; Criterion Referenced Reading Program now totally implemented through the county in another LEA. Similar types of programs are being institutionalized in several LEAs.

ESEA Title V-B—State strengthening

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$983,800
1982 (revised budget)	737,850
Loss: (25 percent)	245,950

Impact at the local level

Impairment to projects such as training centers for teachers of gifted and talented youth, community-based learning centers, alcohol/drug abuse;

Reduction in number of school principals participating in Maryland Professional Development Academy;

Delay, if not elimination of the continued development of model guidance and counseling programs;

Curtailment of implementation support of Project Basic through local staff.

Impact at the State Level

Twenty-five percent loss in the only discretionary money for the State Education Agency (SEA) to support development of model programs which address identified statewide needs. (These funds are not used in Maryland for permanent staff. All funds are used for program activities).

Reduction in SEA efforts to comply with state mandates, e.g.: Improving school guidance programs; project basic; and social studies curriculum; reduction would prevent implementation after two years of development.

Reduction in SEA efforts in providing model programs that address critical needs, e.g.: Alcohol/drug abuse prevention/intervention centers; community-based learning centers; and principal's training for effective leadership in schools.

Elimination of MSDE Internal Staff Development Program.

Major accomplishments

Development of a master model for social studies which will serve as a framework for other curriculum areas;

Establishment of alcohol/drug abuse prevention/intervention centers in key areas of the state which resulted in an increased awareness to the community of the growing seriousness and complexity of this problem in the state;

Development of standards for model guidance and counseling programs;

Improved quality of instruction through competency-based education;

Followup of a selected group of principals attending the Professional Development Academy indicate that 85 percent of the participants were implementing the concepts learned.

Libraries—School library media centers (ESEA Title IV-B)

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:	
Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$3,225,883
1982 (revised budget)	2,419,412
Loss: (25 percent)	806,471

Impact at local level

ESEA Title IV-B provides funds to purchase school library resources, instructional materials, and equipment. The proposed reduction means there will be far less money to purchase materials, the cost of which has far outpaced inflation. The impact will be felt doubly as a result. Many of the local systems have, at best, only been able to maintain their local effort.

The funds from ESEA IV-B were used to support such areas as competency-based instruction—Project Basic (in materials), reading improvement, and microcomputers for mathematics programs. In many of the local systems, fewer schools and children will be provided with less in terms of resources. Overall, school programs will obviously be affected. For example, Baltimore City uses a 4-year cycle to distribute ESEA IV-B funds to the schools.

The following would be the 1982 results of a 25-percent cut there: 18 fewer schools will be served; 12,285 fewer students will be served; 75–80 fewer films will be purchased for the Film Library; 100 fewer periodical subscriptions will be purchased for the Professional Library; and 400 fewer books will be purchased for the collection.

The cycle for funding of equipment is a 2-year cycle, so servicing will be reduced in the following way there: 21 fewer schools will be served; 5,803 fewer students will be served.

Small school systems with certain high cost pupils (reading disadvantaged) would probably be hurt most. If a block grant goes through, apparently no maintenance of effort would be required. This could seriously cut local school library programs.

Impact at the State level

At the State level, with a reduction of administrative funds, MSDE would probably lose the Maryland Review and Evaluation Center. This center provides two staff members who work with Maryland educators in reviewing instructional materials. New textbooks and instructional materials are housed in the Center for preview. If we choose to maintain the Center, then positions within the School Library Media Services Branch would have to be eliminated. The Branch will also have to cut one-half of its professional workshop activities.

Major accomplishments

Maryland's local school systems used Federal funds to support their instructional programs in a multitude of creative ways:

With IV-B funds, Anne Arundel County implemented a mathematics and science program using microcomputers because of IV-B funds;

Calvert County was able to focus on its competency-based education needs, by using IV-B funds to purchase materials;

Montgomery County provides for a highly developed gifted and talented program by purchasing materials which encourage critical thinking skills, as well as microcomputers; and

Howard County has been able to establish a color television studio which supports not only the total school program, but also a high school communications program. The funds have provided over 300 nonpublic schools with materials and equipment which they might never have had, such as microfilm and equipment.

The funds have had an impact on every single public school in the State. There are over a hundred other examples.

Library Services and Construction Act, Title I (LSCA)

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1981 (continuing resolution award—3 quarters recommended 4th quarter funding)	$1,176,242
1982 (Administration's budget)	881,182
Loss: (25.1 percent)	295,060

Impact at the local level

LSCA I funds are used to initiate new programs or services or to provide services to an unserved or underserved group in the community. Grants are made by a competitive evaluation process.

A reduction in funds would reduce the number of projects and amount of funding. Thirty-three projects were funded in 1981 for a total of some $750,000.

Some 450,000 persons are served by new services and programs funded through LSCA. The cut would reduce that number by at least 25 percent.

Impact at the State level

These three statewide programs account for about 25 percent of the current LSCA I appropriation:

Library services to blind and physically handicapped will have to be reduced. The Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped serves over 10,000 persons by direct mail or through schools, retirement centers, other libraries. About one-third of the budget is Federal LSCA funds.

Library services to residents of State institutions would be severely cut. Federal funds provide books, magazines and other materials for education, and occupational information and recreation of some 17,000 residents of State institutions.

Statewide staff development and inservice training programs are provided by the State Library Agency on such topics as management, planning, reference services, providing special information services to special populations such as illiterate, deaf, elderly, etc. Staff throughout the State need regular and substantive inservice training programs to update knowledge and to gain new skills. Reduction in this service would deny these programs to some 300-400 librarians annually.

Major accomplishments

Public libraries have identified major unmet service needs in their communities and have [illegible]ated programs to address these needs with LSCA funds.

In Baltimore City the Enoch Pratt Free Library has instituted a job and career information center that has the support and cooperation of major city agencies and employment services; it also has begun a special program of active support literacy programs throughout the City and is providing a special reading machine (Kurzweil) and other services for the blind and visually handicapped.

Somerset County in cooperation with the school sysytem is providing library and reading centers in schools for adults and a combined public/school library on Smith Island.

T[illegible] public libraries now have a special community information and referral se[illegible]isting individuals to find the appropriate agency to help them with their [illegible] or problems.

Special services to the elderly, the deaf, the homebound are in place in at least 10 library systems.

While some program grants are designed to serve specific population groups, others are for the general population, such as regional film collections. In that respect all counties and all persons using libraries services because of LSCA funds.

Adult education

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:

1982 (continuing resolution)	$2,200,000
1982 (revised budget)	1,440,000
Loss: (34.5 percent)	76,000

Impact at local level

Services to the most needy group would be reduced. Fifty-five percent of adults served this year were from urban areas of high unemployment. Fifty-eight percent were minorities.

ESOL services to those not speaking English would be adversely affected.

Classes would close earlier; summer programs unlikely.

Impact at State level

851,000[1] Maryland adults, 30 percent of the population are without high school diplomas. Financial support is already inadequate: 1979, is 20,000 adults served though ABE, 1980 is 34,500 adults served through ABE.

The state agency will have difficulty remaining in compliance for service to the "least educated and most in need." Individualized instruction and support services are necessary to reach that target population; resources will not be adequate.

Three staff positions would be eliminated.

State-sponsored professional development activities would be eliminated.

Statewide model dissemination/special project activites would be eliminated.

Major accomplishments

34,500 adults served at an average program cost of $60.00 per student.

(a) More than 1,000 were unemployed and obtained jobs as a result of experience gained in programs; (b) 859 changed to or were upgraded to better jobs; (c) 2,300 received high school diplomas; (d) 351 were removed from public assistance; (e) 5,000 adults with limited English ability were served; and (f) more than 1,000 institutionalized adults were enrolled in programs.

Emergency School Aid—LEA grants

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:

1982 (continuing resolution)	$2,586,921
1982 (revised budget)	1,940,191
Loss: (25 percent)	646,730

Impact at the local level:

Ten to fifteen percent (146,000) fewer students will be served; staff will be reduced by 170.

Quality will diminish because projects already have minimal staff; in some cases, all schools identified must be served, thereby reducing quality.

Impact at the State level.—Little impact; program is not administered by the SEA.

Major accomplishments

Human relations counseling has been introduced in school systems through ESAA and has become an integral part of the schools' staffs and programs.

Projects addressing "special student concerns" have increased the awareness of administrators and teachers regarding: Disproportionate treatment of minority students in the application of disciplinary measures; lack of minority parent participation in the schooling of their children.

The magnet school concept introduced through ESAA programs has been helpful in bringing about better racial balance in areas where there has been racially identifiable schools.

---

[1] 1976 Census Update

Prior to fiscal year 1981, ESAA projects allowed instructional focus on remediation in math and reading for Title I eligible children in non-Title I schools.

Civil rights training and advisory services

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$97,014
1982 (revised budget)	72,760
Loss: (25 percent)	24,254

Impact at the local level

This state loss of fiscal support will result in loss at the local level in desegregation implementation:

A loss of assistance in inservice staff development providing administrators and teachers with methods aimed at: Elimination of bias and stereotyping; acceptance of differences in children; role of the principal as the tone setter for desegregation.

One hundred forty thousand (140,000) children will lose the benefit of learning by example from adults skilled at living in a pluralistic setting.

Impact at the State level

Eighty percent of money funds MSDE staff who provide technical assistance and leadership to LEA's to assist in understanding desegregation concerns—this would be reduced.

Compliance in desegregation will be difficult at both federal and state levels.

ESEA title II—Basic skills improvement

Amount of allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$105,000
1982 (revised budget)	78,750
Loss: (25 percent)	26,250

Impact at the local level

Reduces number of LEA subgrants from 15 to 11; fewer children served.

Services from state will not be readily available in each basic skill—different skills may need highlighting in different years. This will not allow the SEA to be of full service to LEAs.

Regional and local follow-up of basic skills improvement efforts to all LEAs will decrease to the few LEAs in most need.

Impact at the State level

Intent of legislation will be further weakened with 50 percent of allocation flowing to LEAs and 50 percent remaining at SEA; neither amount remains significant at a time when basic skills are more, rather than less important.

Statewide inservice training programs for basic skills personnel will be reduced from four to three sessions.

Much of the operating budget of the Basic Skills Branch comes from Title II. The number of individual visits by content specialists to LEAs to provide technical assistance will be reduced, thus affecting overall quality of services to all LEAs.

Major accomplishments

Statewide leadership conference on basic skills held each year.

Development of six publications on basic skills program improvement for LEA use.

An effective state leadership program for basic skill improvement with very little money used for administration.

Basic skills services from the SEA to LEAs are coordinated and supported with aid of this program.

ESEA title VII—Bilingual education

Amount of State allocation—Maryland:

Fiscal year:	
1982 (continuing resolution)	$22,000
1982 (revised budget)	16,600
Loss: (25 percent)	5,400

Impact at the local level

There are currently three local districts in Maryland receiving federal discretionary grants. A 25 percent rescission would decrease that source of funds that assists LEAs in providing direct services to limited English-speaking students. These projects in Maryland currently provide services to over 1,000 students.

Reduces statewide inservice for ESOL personnel from 3 to 2 sessions in priority area of appropriate assistance to limited English-speaking students.

Reduces individual technical assistance to 13 school systems without specialist help in ESOL.

Reduces coordination and technical assistance for preparation of new local basic grants under ESEA Title VII.

Impact at the State level

Reduces number of SEA leadership inservices from three to two for ESOL/bilingual personnel.

Limits the development of appropriate assistance programs for limited English-speaking students. 80 persons service 6,000 students.

Reduces technical assistance and resource services through a funded Resource Center at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County to LEAs.

Reduces bilingual internship program by 1 person.

Major accomplishments

Establishment of Resource Center at UMBC.

Establishment of internship program.

Provision of technical assistance to mid-sized and smaller school systems in particular.

CETA (COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT)

1982 block grant proposal

Unemployment rates for youth, especially economically disadvantaged and minority youth, are significantly higher than rates for the adult population. In the last five years, several comprehensive pieces of legislation have been enacted specifically focusing on youth to attack this problem by encouraging coordination between the labor and education sectors to assist youth in making the transition between school and work.

The Administration's proposal to consolidate youth programs with adult training programs undoes much of the progress made by this legislation and potentially will reduce or eliminate present activities and services directed to making youth employable.

Without having seen legislative proposals, specific concerns are:

One block grant for youth and adult employment programs could jeopardize the 22 percent funding setaside for joint projects between schools and CETA prime sponsors and the Governor's 1 percent setaside for education linkage and coordination. MSDE currently receives $511,692 in linkage monies.

Block grant proposal puts in limbo further planning for the two-year CETA-education demonstration projects that were launched in January.

Elimination of CETA's Title IV Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP), the cornerstone of federal youth employment efforts and the Youth Conservation and Community Improvement Program (YCCIP). The programs would be folded into CETA's Title II-B adult training program.

The relationship between CETA and school districts would be strained as prime sponsors juggle their priorities among adults and teenagers.

The YETP's 22 percent setaside for joint projects between local education agencies and CETA prime sponsors to serve high school youth and dropouts would be wiped out. CETA's YETP trains about 450,000 high school dropouts, graduates and youngsters aged 14 to 21 for employment. YCCIP finds jobs for about 50,000 youth in the same age group, mostly in weatherization and housing rehabilitation projects.

The proposed CETA block grant will follow Title II-B eligibility guidelines, which are more restrictive than the Title IV programs. This would screen out many youngsters who are eligible for Title IV programs.

Major accomplishments to date

Strengthening educational component in the traditional CETA programs for in-school youth and providing jobs for economically disadvantaged in-school youth.

Assisting local school systems in consolidating all available resources toward program goals.

FUNDS ANTICIPATED IN MARYLAND FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982—FORWARD-FUNDED-PROGRAMS [1]

Programs	1981 current allocations	Md 1982 share of 1981 continuing resolution	Md 1982 share of 1981 revised (including rescissions)	Percent decrease current funds to revised budget	Percent continuing resolution to revised budget	Loss in dollars
	A	B	C	(A-C)	(B-C)	
Title I, LEA grants	$45,364,063	$49,502,541	$36,956,790	18.5	25.3	$12,545,751
Title I, State admin	772,518	772,518	542,194	29.8	29.8	230,324
Title IV-C, Local innov	2,798,000	1,695,000	927,000	66.9	45.3	768,000
Title V-B, State strength	983,800	983,800	737,850	25.0	25.0	245,950
ESAA, LEA grants	2,586,921	2,586,921	1,940,191	25.0	25.0	646,730
Civil Rights Act, Training and Advisory Service	97,014	97,014	[2] 72,760	25.0	25.0	24,254
Title IV-B, Library Instructional Materials	3,225,883	3,225,883	2,419,412	25.0	25.0	806,471
Educ. Handicapped-State grants	20,435,211	21,457,000	16,143,000	21.0	24.8	5,314,000
Educ. Handicapped-Preschool Incentive	526,000	526,000	394,000	25.0	25.0	132,000
Educ. Handicapped-Personnel Development	180,000	[3] 170,000	0	100.0	100.0	170,000
Title I, handicapped	2,621,529	3,115,000	2,322,000	11.4	25.5	793,000
Vocational rehabilitation independent living	159,000	191,000	153,000	3.8	19.9	38,000
Vocational education State grants	13,417,251	13,417,251	10,362,591	22.8	22.8	3,054,660
Adult education	1,851,000	2,200,000	1,440,000	22.2	34.5	760,000
Basic skills (ESEA, Title II)	105,000	105,000	78,750	25.0	25.0	26,250
Total	95,123,190	100,044,928	74,489,538			25,555,390

[1] Funding for these programs is allocated to the states for the fiscal year after the year in which the federal appropriation is enacted. Thus, currently (during fiscal year 1981), programs are operating from the federal fiscal year 1980 appropriation. The federal fiscal year 1981 continuing resolution, for which the following rescissions are being sought, would provide the state and local allocations for fiscal year 1982. State and local districts have carried out budget and staff planning based on this continuing resolution amount.

[2] 75 percent of grants awarded in fiscal year 1982—not a formula allocation.

[3] Elimination of grant award in fiscal year 1982. All "Z" Cycle states would lose fiscal year 1982 grant awards. Others would be funded at 25 percent reduction.

FUNDS ANTICIPATED IN MARYLAND FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982—CURRENT-FUNDED PROGRAMS [1]

Programs	1981 Maryland share of 1981 continuing resolution	1981 share revised to include recommended rescissions	1982 Reagan recommendations	Percent decrease (includes rescission) 1981-82	Loss in dollars
	A	B	C		
Vocational rehabilitation basic grants	12,790,000	12,790,000	[2] 9,593,000	25.0	3,197,100
Vocational rehabilitation SSDI funds	1,168,162	1,168,162	0	100.0	1,168,162
Vocational rehabilitation SSI funds	553,151	553,151	0	100.0	553,151
Public libraries (LSCA, Title I)	1,176,242	1,176,242	881,182	25.1	295,060
Impact aid	19,853,000	17,867,700	[3] 0	100.0	17,867,700
Child nutrition	65,904,992	65,904,992	39,451,248	40.1	26,453,744
Total	101,445,547	99,460,247	49,925,430		49,534,817

[1] Funds for these programs are allocated to state and local districts the same year in which the federal appropriation is enacted. Thus, Maryland's current (fiscal year 1981) funds are from the federal fiscal year 1981 continuing resolution. In some cases, as indicated below, rescissions are being recommended for amounts remaining in this fiscal year (through Sept. 30, 1981).

[2] Will be part of a social services block grant from Department of HHS to Governor's office.

[3] Change in eligibility would eliminate all Maryland funds. Only heavily-impacted "A" districts eligible.

Note: Loss total for both Foreward- and current-funded programs is $75,090,207.

TESTIMONY OF PERCY V. WILLIAMS, JULY 1, 1981

My name is Percy V. Williams, Assistant State Superintendent of Schools in the Maryland State Department of Education. I am here today representing the State Superintendent, the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and as part of the larger community, in Maryland committed to public education. We are here to discuss the extremely serious situation which will arise in our state if the President's Economic Plan is enacted by Congress. The impact of the President's proposals permeates the entire educational system and reaches deeply into the community. Children and adults, rich and poor, handicapped and those not disabled will all lose service in schools, libraries, adult education, and vocational and training programs. It is crystal clear, and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—the impact will *not* fall evenly upon all, but will fall disproportionately on the poor and the handicapped. But more than that, it is a subterfuge. The plan would take away money from the poor and handicapped for vouchers and tax credits for the rich to send their children to private schools. Public schools are the bulwark for democracy and any plan which chips away the foundation is weakening the structure of our national security.

The Reagan Economic Plan, if enacted as proposed, would result in a loss of $75 million to the 750,000 school children in Maryland for the school year beginning in September, or an average of $3,000 for each class of 30 children. If spread evenly like this, the impact would have seriously damaging consequences. But, let me describe for you the skewed impact on programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, as well as other programs in our state.

As proposed by the Reagan administration, Maryland would lose $12.5 million (or 25.3 percent) of our funds for disadvantaged youngsters. Special assistance, principally with reading, writing, and arithmetic, will be eliminated for approximately 10,000 economically and educationally disadvantaged children. There are about 125,000 youngsters eligible for this assistance in Maryland. The present funding level allows service to only 65,000 before the funds run out. With the Reagan Plan, Maryland faces losing a full one-quarter of what we have. It is also estimated that over 1,100 staff positions will be eliminated.

Second, the proposed reductions call for the state to lose nearly $6.5 million in funds for handicapped children. That represents 25.4 percent of our federal funds for this important undertaking. With such a loss, services for some 25,000 handicapped young people would have to be reduced. Maryland and the nation have made a great commitment over the past several years to serve handicapped children, to take them figuratively and literally from under the proverbial staircase. Now we face the prospect of the federal government reneging on that promise. In addition, other special cuts of over $1,000,000 are proposed. Those funds presently provide services to 5,000 handicapped preschoolers, training for teachers to work with handicapped children, and services for severely handicapped children in institutions.

The proposed cuts do not stop with school based special education programs. Maryland also stands to lose nearly $5,000,000 in vocational rehabilitation funds. That is 33.9 percent of all we receive from federal sources. This is particularly significant since federal funds represent 80 percent of our total vocational rehabilitation program. Last year vocational rehabilitation served 20,000 handicapped citizens, most of whom are severely disabled. More than 6,500 completed their rehabilitation program. Now we must face laying off 150 counselors, evaluators, trainers, and others, or closing the vital Maryland Rehabilitation Center, which is one of only nine in the United States.

The proposed cuts also will result in a loss of $26.5 million or 40.1 percent to child nutrition programs. That includes losses to schools, institutions, and child care centers. It impacts on both school lunches and school breakfast programs. The losses eliminate the summer food service program at recreation centers and summer camps, the assistance to purchase food service equipment, and the nutrition education programs across the entire state.

The list of proposed cuts goes on and on: vocational education ($3 million); impact aid ($17.8 million); public and school libraries ($1 million); and several more. Details for individual program losses are listed in chart form on the handout sheet.

It has been suggested that deregulation and block grants would produce savings to lessen the effects of these cuts. Whether or not these savings are real or imagined, whether or not deregulation will ultimately come or not, there is no proposal to produce savings to offset the reductions proposed for this next school year. Thus the same administrative and regulatory burdens will have to be carried with fewer dollars. Moreover, anyone who thinks that even total repeal of laws accompanied by total deregulation will produce savings remotely approaching the proposed cuts is just plain wrong.

If the cuts as proposed by President Reagan are adopted by the Congress, one of two results will follow: there will be a dramatic reduction in services impacting most harshly upon those most in need, or the state and/or local government will have to pick up certain costs resulting in tax increases for everyone.

The damage which will be done to education will be severe when measured in loss of opportunity for children. But there is another factor I suggest we ponder. If block grants or consolidation is accompanied by cuts of the magnitude proposed, it will result in those most in need not only losing services, but it is likely that those groups who should be working together will instead fight with one another for what is left. In addition, block grant funds without any strings are likely to open the door for teacher associations and unions to fight to have the money used for higher salaries to combat inflation rather than provide better programs for children. I urge reflection on the consequences of those two facts.

We shall pay now or we shall pay later. Today the costs are educational programs. Tomorrow the costs will be those resulting from the inability of citizens to read, write, and calculate; resulting in handicapped persons being dependent for a lifetime, growing into dependency on public assistance; and a larger number in prisons and juvenile training institutions.

The State Department of Education has prepared a detailed analysis of the impact of the proposed cuts for each of some twenty programs. We would be happy to make this available to any interested party.

Finally, it is argued that the budget must be cut. I do not necessarily quarrel with that conclusion. But I do quarrel with the fact that once again the handicapped, the poor, and the disadvantaged must disproportionately bear the burden. Human services which represent an investment in human capital are being cast aside. And in the case of education, we are talking about the legacy each generation leaves to the generation which follows.

In the words of one of our great presidents, I end with, "Nothing matters more for the future of our country: not even our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace: not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower: not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

We cannot long endure as a democratic, free, and responsible people without adequate systems of free public schools. Freedom has no permanent defense against totalitarianism except the inquiring, logical, and courageous minds of educated people.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS DESHIELDS, PRESIDENT, GWYNNS FALLS PARK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, JULY 1, 1981

PROBLEMS OF RETENTION, DRUG TRAFFICKING, SPENDING REDUCTIONS IMPACT AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Good afternoon, the Honorable Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat 7th Congressional District, State of Maryland, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, and to your Committee and other invited guests.

As the current President of the Parent-Teacher-Student Association at P.S. #91, Gwynns Falls Park Jr. High School, I am honored that you selected me to participate in this hearing. I was born and raised in Baltimore City and attended its public schools. Having been a resident of the Gwynns Falls community for 22 years, I have also witnessed its many changes. Being concerned and active parents, we have continuously worked with civic organizations and local PTA's for the betterment of our children's education and for Baltimore in general. Currently, I am also a member of the Southwest Regional Advisory Committee chaired by Dr. Joel Carrington, Regional Superintendent, Southwest Region, Baltimore City Public Schools, and I also serve on the Baltimore Education Advisory Council representing the Southwest Region.

As you know, PTA's in general reflect on the community's collective abilities and needs and since the early 1900's there has been a constant increase in the number of school age youth who qualify to attend our public schools and choose to do so. However, in the past few years, this trend has reversed itself. More and more school age youth are dropping out of school for a variety of reasons. To combat the negative impact of school-dropouts on our community, and to encourage the retention of our youth in school, our PTA:

A. Has meetings on a timely basis to give support to administrators, to teachers and to the pupils as a means of encouraging their attendance, and their retention in school.

B. We have several fund raisers at our school and in other segments of our community to generate funds for educational activities because the school system cannot "do it all." For example, though we are unable to purchase the additional musical instruments that our school band needs, we do use our monies to purchase the accessories that the band needs to develop our community's musicians of the future. These kinds of activities enhance the interpersonal and the educational experiences which positively impact on our youth.

Additionally, our school and the community could greatly benefit from any source of funds to upgrade the gymnasium area including its toilet facilities and the addition of improved locker room facilities. There is also a great need to develop our wasted acreage in the rear of the immediate building. This land should be improved by the addition of baseball diamonds, a track field and basketball courts. The students and the community can use ths outdoor area for wholesome recreational and leisure-time activities. The esthetics of our building would be greatly enhanced by painting exterior windows and doors, too. With these improvements, our school can better fulfill its heritage and become a more prominent community center, thus creating an atmosphere of togetherness, of pride and of esteem in our neighborhood.

C. Our commitment warrants our serving on several educational advisory committees. This involvement helps us to generate strategies which we feel will assist our junior high school in improving the potential for our young people to want to attend school and to graduate.

D. Participation in "Youthworks Programs" which houses itself in our school and develops in our youth a sense for the added value of the school facility as a worksite and as the hub from which many skills can be developed that increases the worthiness of the building to our young people and thus, encourages their retention in school and a more cost effective utilization of the building.

E. The School Community Centers Program at our school is a supplemental educational, recreational and leisure time program which is operational under the auspices of the Baltimore City Public School System, Division of Adult and Community Education. This program is supported and encouraged by our PTA because it allows for the extended use of our facility immediately after school, on weekends, on holidays and during the summer. This program, too, encourage retention of our youth in school, reduces vandalism in our school, gives additional supervision to our young people, gives structure with flexibility to our youth's repertoire of experiences and most certainly increases the value of the school to all segments of our community.

F. The Urban Gardening Program utilizes the resources of our young people and the physical plant and grounds of our school to plant and to harvest fresh vegetables. Again, this activity enhances, in our opinion, school retention because the value of the school to the community and the youthful utilizers of the facility is increased as they identify with more and more positive experiences that call for the use of the building. Yes, this school's PTA recognizes the need to do all that it can to encourage its youth to partake of the services generated by our involvement and our commitment to the education of our children.

Moreover, as is the case in other communities, drug trafficking is a problem for both in school and out-of-school youth. It is a problem that crosses all boundaries and infiltrates the "best of communities." Our PTA, as a means of support to the school staff, is supportive of the teaching of the curriculum related to drug abuse, and we leave no stone unturned in encouraging our youth to be wise decision-makers when it comes to the proper use of drugs.

As I sit here today in front of you, I know that the Governor's wish to cut an additional 3 percent from the budget of the Maryland State Department of Education as reported by local newspapers is a threat to the continued funding of the School Community Centers Program. I strongly feel that "Reaganomics" has given rise for these additional cuts in the budget. However, with the threat of drug trafficking, with one or both parents out of work, with young adults in families who have graduated from college and high school out of work, with younger family member out of school for the summer, family tension is increased and so is susceptibility to become involved in drugs as a "cop-out." Now more than ever, the need for supplemental, educational, recreational and leisure-time activities in the absence of a more viable alternative, work, a job, should be encouraged and not threatend with extinction.

By not being aware of this State's final decision relative to the funding of the School Community Centers Progam, the spending reduction impact of the impending budget cuts will have a direct impact on Gwynns Falls Junior High School because it has been an S.C.C.P. site for ten years. We hope that this program is not cut from this school system's delivery of services, and we encourage the Maryland State Department of Education to think this matter over carefully.

Summarily, in each of the experiences related to the aforementioned testimony, our PTA, more specifically our parents, our teachers, our administrators, our community organizations, our volunteers and our young people have assisted us and participated with us in our thrust to better the educational process in Baltimore as a whole and thus, we feel this has improved the lives, and the experiences of each of us though we know, that our future lies in the well-being of our young people.

On behalf of all of our supporters and the fine young people for whom all of this is about, we thank you, the Honorable Parren J. Mitchell, and the members of your committee for granting us this opportunity to say "we want to do better," and we look forward to your continued support of our efforts.

Baltimore City Public Schools Testimony on Drug Abuse in Schools

I am extremely pleased to have been invited to this important hearing in order to present testimony on what has become one of the most serious concerns in our society today—Drug Abuse and Drug Prevention, and specifically the traffic of drugs in our schools.

How serious is this problem? It's become so complex an issue that solutions are almost beyond our comprehension. We have laws on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. Yet it is estimated that better than half of our society breaks these laws regularly. What can one tell children about drugs when the adults in the community, who should be serving as role models for the youngsters, are consuming as much or more than the youngsters, themselves? How serious would the problem be if, suddenly, half of the drivers in our city decided that they no longer had to respect our traffic laws?

From the point of view of educators, the problem becomes: Attempting to teach children in schools, under the influence of drugs, who are unable to learn, are a disruption or a distraction in class, and are generally taking precious time of staff dedicated to teaching.

Clearly, drugs are a barrier between the teacher and the student. We can say we are in the knowledge business, and drug abuse should not be one of our concerns. But if we took this position, we would be putting our heads in the sand.

So we ask what we can do to solve the problem. And we look at what we are already doing to see if it is all we can do. Within our Security Area, our front lines in dealing with the safety of our school facilities, we average roughly 140 arrests a year for simple possession of drugs. Out of this total, about 20–25 arrests are made for distribution, a far more serious offense. This is, of course, hardly the tip of the iceberg.

Many educators feel that at the very most, we can only work to keep drugs out of schools through a commitment by staff to make possession and use of drugs in school buildings so uncomfortable that youngsters simply won't want to bring them to school.

This would mean training teachers and administrators beyond the knowledge they may have at present in recognizing drugs and drug-related equipment, and in dealing with students under the influence of drugs. Unfortunately, many educators simply ignore children under the influence of drugs if these youngsters aren't bothering anyone. Or, educators may fail to realize what is wrong with a child who has taken drugs.

In acknowledging the role, we as educators must play in keeping drugs out of schools, substantially more would have to be done in the way of staff development; for certainly, if a survey of teacher and administrator awareness of the problem were given, I fear we would be sadly lacking the comprehensive knowledge we would need to deal with the concern as a total school system, and perhaps it is only through a systemwide effort that we could begin to keep the drug traffic in our schools to a minimum.

And of course, the problem remains that with only so much time for teaching in a given school day, how much can educators do to work on drug prevention also?

Thus, the first line of defense against drugs would be the commitment of staff and the training of staff. The other side of the coin is what we are able to provide for children, especially young and impressionable children, so that they can make responsible decisions when faced with inevitable peer pressure to take marijuana and drugs.

Through a variety of instructional programs, many beginning at an early age, children are given a good portion of the information they need about kinds of drugs, appearance of drugs, how drugs harm the body, and so forth.

Once again, what can we teach children that will make a difference in their lives and curb the use of drugs? Above all, educational programs for children must be brutally honest. It is difficult to admit, but children may have a far greater grasp of the basics of drug information than we would like to admit. It does no good to inform children that taking marijuana will lead to taking hard drugs when they may know this is not the case. But perhaps what children should know is that what is being purchased certainly has no uniform quality. Children must know that what they are purchasing, particularly marijuana, ages in a peculiar manner, and in fact, oxidizes, thus causing it to change its composition and become very harmful.

Children should know, also, that many incidents of a criminal nature in schools and out are drug-related, and that ultimately, it becomes prohibitively expensive to purchase marijuana and drugs, and the result is an enormous rise in street crime.

We have considered the role staff may play in drug prevention through staff development and a commitment to deal with the problem; and we have considered briefly how to approach the problem through various instructional means. But what of the parents and other adults, so many of whom may themselves be drug users and abusers. It is a tragedy of our times that children witness drug abuse taking place in homes and on streets where the very drug abusers are those closest to the children. Youngsters and adults in this situation may be beyond our help. But there are parents who care deeply and are witnessing behaviors in their children which they may not recognize, and certainly have no precedent for dealing with.

Parents must in some manner, perhaps through Adult Education programs, perhaps through community-sponsored activities, perhaps through media's commitment to provide them with information, be prepared to deal with children before the problem is out of hand. What must parents need to know? They must notice and be prepared to deal with drastic changes in a child's mood or behavior. They must notice attitudinal or response changes, and they must be prepared to deal with a major falling off in a child's school grades, for, as was noted earlier, it is almost impossible to learn when a child is under the influence of drugs.

Schools and society must acknowledge the fact that drugs are being taken at earlier and earlier ages. Drug awareness programs in schools, therefore, begin at the earliest grades, and we must recognize still another problem which is something difficult to face: Courts can do little or nothing with nine-year-old drug abusers. This may be the saddest fact of all.

In confronting the responsibilities of children, educators, and parents, we must be willing to acknowledge that drug abuse is not a problem that can singularly be placed in the lap of the school community. Unfortunately, schools, in dealing with society's problems, become scapegoats when the time comes to blame someone for the ills around us. Realistically, can we in education be held responsible for what a child is doing on a street corner in the evening hours? Of course not. But we can be aware of what goes on in our schools, and here is where we can make a considerable difference.

At this point it is worth taking a closer look at the specifics of what we are providing, most notably through our health education area, in bringing children information on drugs. We have used the preventive approach by raising the students' level of self-esteem. This goes on from grades K-12, and this is the fifth year we have used this method. We feel a child needs to feel good about his or her self, and especially needs to have a life's goal in mind as early as possible. Also, a child needs to be excited about the possibilities in learning and in life. Thus, we would hope we are dealing with the social, mental, emotional, and physical-well being of the young person. Here, we try to get the children to understand that if they take drugs or alcohol excessively, and get into trouble, or do other counterproductive things as they are growing up, it will most certainly delay a life's goal. We believe we are reaching the whole person here and we even go as far as dealing with key relationships with family, friends and society.

We like to view this as a pioneer effort that, if it hasn't shown drug reduction results to a significant degree as yet, is, at least, causing attitudinal changes, and giving youngsters the information with which they can make informed decisions on this critical aspect of their lives.

For your information, within the 12 week Health Education Component there is heavy emphasis on drug information focusing on life's goals and self-concept.

It is also worth mentioning, for the record, that project DARE began last year through the efforts of the school system, the State Drug Administration and the Police Department as a Staff Development project that has been extremely well-received by our teachers and others.

I wanted to cite these efforts to demonstrate that all is not hopeless in the war against drugs. Positive things are taking place. We recognize there are no short-term solutions and we believe these approaches, in dealing with staff and with the self-concept of the child, will make a difference.

We spoke about parent education programs earlier as well. We know from teaching children about smoking that they actively confront adults to get them to stop, and that smoking for youngsters and adults, has been reduced. Perhaps children armed with knowledge about drugs, and alcohol, can make an impact on adults here, too.

We must continue to emphasize to children that drugs can cause poor vision when driving, can cause you to be arrested even if you are only in the vicinity of a drug arrest, can settle in the reproductive tissues and do great harm health-wise. Also, we want children to think about being able to control what happens to them, and in the area of drugs know they can control their choices.

We recommend also that more caring adults such as recreation leaders, church officials, and others join us in helping our children to grow up in a drug-free atmosphere. And we must continue to emphasize to young people that they, in many cases, must make the choices themselves, change if necessary themselves, because unfortunately, all too often, adults have failed to properly guide them. This is a case where children may help adults more than the other way around.

In conclusion, we urge more parent education, additional staff development, a continuation of the preventive instructional effort we now have in Health Education—and perhaps more of it and a growing involvement from adults outside of education who truly care about our children. All of these factors will ultimately go into saving our children and winning the war against drugs, in schools and in society.

BALTIMORE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL TESTIMONY ON DROPOUTS, TRUANCY, RETENTION, AND DRUGS

In representing the school system of Baltimore City, and in addressing the needs of the students of Baltimore City, and of the families and the community at large, I am most appreciative of having been given the opportunity to present this testimony.

That there are grave concerns in education and our society we must face immediately, is something no one can deny. And perhaps the most serious of our concerns is the fate of our children in a world that based on the dollar value placed upon them in terms of educational expense, views them as being worth very little.

Consider, for example, that dropout proneness predictability is often evident as early as the 4-5 grade level. It is at this age that we could, with proper resources, identify the problems of youngsters and act to prevent their leaving school at a later date. This is a major problem that could be solved to a considerable extent with additional counselors at the elementary level. At this time we have no elementary school counselors.

In 1973, we had 48 elementary school counselors working in 135 schools. All were eliminated in budget cuts around that period. In fact, getting those 48 counselors into our elementary schools took nearly ten years. It should be noted that every elementary school in Baltimore County at present has a counselor.

At least one way to attack the problem of dropouts is to reach children at the early grades. Parents should be aware of the danger signs. So should teachers. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult for teachers whose primary commitment is the classroom program to take on the role of social psychologists and deal with the concerns of students who may be potential dropouts.

At least one recommendation here would be for the Baltimore City Public Schools to have one elementary counselor for every three schools, working with children at the upper elementary grades; and these counselors must work with parents at that level because the sad truth is that as children get progressively older, parents seem to drop out of the picture themselves, as far as education is concerned.

Still another serious concern that must be dealt with is the transition a child makes from elementary to junior high school. We can't be certain why this is so, but we do know that youngsters with problems at the elementary level are more likely to have attendance problems at the junior high level, unless steps are taken early to deal with those problems. This goes for students who were not truant in elementary school but demonstrated problems other than attendance which in secondary school become attendance concerns.

There are many indicators that tell us the biggest problems are at the junior high age. When the change is made, youngsters may be going from a small school where they were in contact with 1-2 teachers to a large school where suddently they must deal with possibly eight to ten teachers. In terms of preventing students from dropping out, this transition must be dealt with.

In truth, truancy is a symptom of a larger problem such as fear of school, fear of failure, a learning difficulty, or even some family concern.

Remarkably, attendance in the city schools has been at a consistent 86-87 percent over the past five years, an excellent figure when compared with some of the other urban systems. But you should realize one of the reasons for this has been the dedication of some 100 CETA workers who assisted the school as full-time attendance monitors. Needless to say, these CETA workers made an enormous difference and are one of the main reasons why our systemwide attendance figure has remained so high. But, we are facing the next school year without these attendance monitors because they have been cut from our staff.

What were some of the tasks they performed? They worked closely with the children and with their families. They visited homes and addressed parent and child concerns. They sent letters home when necessary. They assisted youngsters with school-related problems.

These figures should be noted in the record: In any school system like ours, that has 13 percent of the students absent on a given day—that 13 percent of 130,000; next year we anticipate our enrollment will be around 118,000—7-8 percent will be absent for illness or other valid reasons. Thus, 5 percent are likely to be truant.

There is a statistic here which I believe indicates a serious trend is taking place. The trend is based upon a comparison of graduates to dropouts in terms of numbers of each in a given year. By dropouts, I mean simply those over 16 and gone from schools with no record of employment, marriage, or military. Last year our figures showed for the first time, more dropouts than graduates. In fact, there were some 6,200 graduates compared to 7,200 dropouts.

Leaving school early is a symptom, as is truency, and the reasons for it are complex. We are also noting the return of many of these dropouts to Adult Education programs. But the dropout picture is certainly a disturbing one.

What are some of the reasons for the growth of the dropout problem? One may be fewer vocational programs than we had ten years ago. And certainly, badly needed are more pre-vocational programs in our junior high schools. Programs such as these offer our children important choices and bring actual work experiences into the classroom. Additionally, there must be consideration for additional work-study programs and experiences, provided by the business community and government, either paid or voluntary. Currently, systemwide, about 1,200 students are in such programs, and these are mostly seniors.

If the work experiences provided no salaries for youngsters involved, perhaps additional academic credit can be given. One such program is CABLES, at Northwestern, sending about 600 youngsters into the community to work in hospitals, senior citizens homes, banks, and a variety of other businesses.

More of these kinds of programs are badly needed so that students can feel a part of the larger society and learn the responsibilities of a job situation. Establishing these kinds of situations for students can go a long way in curbing truency and the dropout rate.

Another needed policy to keep students in school is the return to basics which many feel should have come a long time ago, and which needs more emphasis than ever today. Students need structure, need standards. If anything, the large number of choices may confuse them, and certainly offering courses with no practical applicability wastes money, student time, and use of staff. We should have been more concerned over the years, as we certainly are now, that youngsters with poor language and/or computing skills were being placed in exotic language programs or even computer programs. Mastering Basic Skills gives a youngster the confidence to move on and the desire to finish school.

In this regard, we badly need more teachers with special skills in the areas of reading, mathematics, and areas that will serve our young people personally and professionally throughout their lives.

Students do not usually know what they need. It is our job to know what they need and to program for it. This is where the role of the counselor is so important, and this is why it is so regrettable that not only in this area where we have lost 100 CETA workers, we are also forced to reduce our guidance staff significantly, along with our social workers and home visitors. This is all part of our total staff reduction across the system, and, in fact, at this time our social workers, the remaining force in the system, work with students on a ratio of 4,000 youngsters to each social worker. We are working hard to hold the student-counselor ratio at 400-to-1.

What can parents and community organizations do to help with the process of educating this generation's children? One answer, and certainly one that is at present beyond budget consideration, is a stronger parent education component within the structure of Adult Education. At one time, in the Baltimore City Public Schools, eight full-time staff persons in the Adult Education area worked exclusively on parent education programs, or parent effectiveness training, as it is commonly called today.

If we were fortunate enough to have staff working with parents of our students, what could we hope to teach them? We could certainly teach them the danger signs to look for in children's behavior and to deal with it. We could teach them how best to support their children in the schools. We could teach them how to more comfortably work with teachers and school staff. We could teach them how to be part of essential survival skills and sex education programs, and certainly we could teach them more about the tragic problem of teenage pregnancy.

It is worth considering the problem of teenage pregnancy, as a concern of educators and as a societal concern, because certainly it is one of the truly enormous problems of our time, and it is also a "Recycling" problem because it repeats itself so often from mother to child. Survival skills alone may not be enough. More on the subject of human sexuality must be taught. The option to this is ignorance, and here education, in all honesty, must plead only a partial responsibility. The responsibility for helping young people and their families must be shared with other agencies such as social services and juvenile services. And we cannot afford to wait and to plan how we intend to approach this problem. The time to act is now. That is, if we care about our children.

In the context of theory and observation, it may be safe to conclude there are three basic kinds of parents: Parents who care and know how to care; Parents who don't care, even though they know how to care; and Parents who care, but don't know enough about how to care. It is this third group of parents we must attempt to reach with training.

There can be no denying that we must take stronger measures in dealing with the drug problem in teenagers. We feel, in the Baltimore City Public Schools, that our policy is sufficiently strict, and also flexible enough to permit us to handle individual cases in the best interests of the child with whom we are dealing. We can be tough or lenient as the situation may dictate. We never wanted an absolute policy . . . except in the area of dealing with "Pushers." We are working with enormous dedication to the task of removing them from our schools. Anyone caught selling or distributing drugs is immediately suspended. But the child caught "Smoking" need not necessarily be suspended. I repeat: "A child caught selling must be arrested and suspended." Supply and distribution is the major problem here, and we feel we have a fairly good hold on the distribution situation.

However, there is a far larger problem that is not being effectively dealt with. That is Alcohol. We tend to dramatize the drug problem, but alcohol may be the far greater danger.

Beyond that, there must be considered the availability of drug treatment programs in our community. Here, it should be noted that there are 20 Drug Treatment programs in Baltimore, and 18 may deal exclusively with hard drugs or methadone. Only two such programs work with children under the age of 18. The availability of drug counseling for children is clearly a disgrace. And it is being cut back even more. The priority has always been the Adult Addict, or Detoxification. The feeling is that children are only "experimenting."

And the burden is placed, one again, on the schools, to come up with solutions to this problem that plagues our society. Consider here that the options are frightening. Should the child be managed in school, at the possible expense of teaching other youngsters, or should the child be removed and sent out on the streets where there are no programs to help, and where he or she can do great harm to self or to innocent people?

The school system provides professional development programs in child abuse, and in drug and alcohol counseling and in other areas when, in reality, we should be able to refer children. But there are so few places to which we can refer. We must make some serious decisions now. We must determine, as a community, as a city, as a society, what we want for our children. And when we decide, we must take the responsibility to carry out what is best.

In the area of parent education, certainly drug and alcohol abuse are items we can present. Unfortunately, too many of the adults in our society are poor role models because of their own problems with drugs and alcohol.

Still another area of concern is Mental Health Services, when needed, for our youngsters. One of the most unpopular causes today is attempting to deal with the emotionally disturbed youngster. Unfortunately, many perceive that there are only two ways to work with this kind of young person. The easy method, and the one most often utilized, is punishment. The other approach, getting help, is often ignored. The general mood is for punishment rather than counseling or treatment; perhaps it is time to take the hard way rather than the easy way, and deal with the problem through real care for the child.

In conclusion, it is obvious we need a great deal more in the way of resources than is presently available in educating our children. We need more teachers in the basic areas; we need a pupil service area that has more staff to work with these complex problems; we need more pre-vocational and vocational programs at the secondary level. There should also be more work-study components. Additional services in the community must be provided for students with drug, alcohol, and emotional problems. Schools are ill-equipped to deal in this area. Parent education is an absolute necessity. More programs and more emphasis on survival skills and especially more programs dealing with teen pregnancy are areas that must be considered in the context of preparing our children to take their places in our society.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF QUENTIN LAWSON, DIRECTOR, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CITY OF BALTIMORE

I am Quentin Lawson, the director of Human Development for the city of Baltimore and I am pleased to be able to address you today regarding the affect of the Federal budgets cuts on our educational system. An extensive analysis of the Federal budget cuts and their impact on all of Baltimore city conducted by Mayor Schaefer revealed a 257 million dollar loss in Federal aid to the city over a 14-month period. I repeat, a quarter of a billion dollar reduction imposed over just 14 months.

This loss translates into a critical curtailment of vital services both for our citizens and, consequently, of jobs for people who offer those services.

Eleven million dollars are being cut from direct Federal aid to our city's school system and children it serves. While eleven million pales somewhat in the face of the total 257 million dollar loss, I want to emphasize that the vast majority of the Federal budget cuts to Baltimore city impact directly and severely upon our ability to provide the support system which we know to be vital to the success of our children's future.

Allow me to provide you with a few examples of what I mean:

When we suffer a loss of approximately 10,000 jobs in Baltimore city as a result of budget cuts, that translates into some 10,000 parents who must be consumed by trying to pay the rent, rather than by helping their children with homework.

The jobs of over 500 CETA workers who provided much needed assistance in our schools and to our children, have been eliminated.

Over 200,000 citizens in Baltimore city are functionally illiterate. In spite of our newly created literacy commission, our capacity to diminish the illiteracy rate is substantially reduced by the Federal budget cuts to our literacy training programs.

With subsidies to the poor, in the form of food stamps, housing and health care sizeably reduced, so too is our ability to foster the proper learning environment for our children. If you are hungry, poorly housed and without adequate health care, how can learning take place?

These examples, when added to the eleven million dollar loss in direct funding to education, only serve to expand the total loss to education and deepen its impact.

The eleven million dollar direct loss to our Balitmore city school system can be seen and will be felt thusly:

Approximately 5 million dollars will be eliminated from Title I funds for disadvantaged children. This loss will impact severely upon services for these children—services ranging from basic skills instruction to special counseling and clinical services for children with speech impediments.

One million dollars will be cut from the impact aid program which translates into a loss of 60 teachers and an increase to an already high teach/pupil ratio. This 1 million dollar loss will force the closing of the impact aid program entirely.

As our refugee population steadily increases in Baltimore, our ability to properly mainstream these people into our culture, will substantially decrease as a result of Federal budget cuts to our bilingual education program.

Our handicapped education program will be substantially reduced affecting some 4,500 handicapped children.

It has been said that youngsters who are hungry can not learn and that may well be the case this fall as nearly 1,500,000 fewer lunches will be served to students at school resulting from a reduction in funds for child nutrition in excess of 2 million dollars.

The Community College of Baltimore, which has been viewed by many, as providing a viable second chance for our city's young adults, will suffer a 40 percent reduction in enrollment equaling a loss of 2,000 students annually because of Federal budget cuts.

At a time when student achievement in our city schools is at an all time high which has reduced the gap between Baltimore's academic test scores and the national norm from a 2 year gap to a 6 month gap, now those proud gains are in danger of being nullified because of the dismantling of the school system's infrastructure.

It has been and is the city's position that the administration should have been more selective and careful in determining the places for budget reductions. Programs with demonstrated success should clearly not have been cut.

SUMMARY OF BUDGET LOSS

Program	National	Local
Economic Development Administration	$625,000,000	$4,500,000
C.E.T.A.	4,406,000,000	37,000,000
Social Services	2,449,943,000	24,000,000
Health	3,266,000,000	34,000,000
Education	3,796,490,000	10,500,000
Transportation	3,001,000,000	28,000,000
H.C.D.	1,112,800,000	18,000,000
V.A. Hospital		100,000,000
Total	18,657,233,000	257,000,000

Baltimore City Council,
Second District,
Baltimore, Md., July 1, 1981.

Hon. Parren J. Mitchell,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Mitchell: I thank you for the concern reflected by your convening of today's hearing, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify. Although many have begun to assess the fiscal impact of Reaganomics upon Baltimore City and our citizens, we will not fully know that impact until it is felt, beginning within the next few months.

By way of background, Baltimore City's property tax, now $5.97 per $100 of assessed valuation, is double or triple that of any other Maryland subdivision. Despite this extraordinary local effort, however, income from property taxes account for only 16 percent of our total annual budget. All local taxes, including property tax, can provide us with only 24 percent of the money we need to run the City. The remaining funds come from State and federal sources. The impact of cutbacks, combined with block-granting, begins to be understood when we realize that 25 percent of our City budget is spent on education, within the Baltimore City Public Schools. This agency has suffered severely from CETA cutbacks, losing approximately 450 employees on two months' notice. Subsequent layoffs—by the hundreds—have occurred in the past months, affecting teachers and aides paid through general funds. Education, which is everybody's business, is getting the business from every level of government.

And that is for starters.

Three thousand local families who should have received CETA income this year will do without. They and our economy suffer. A work ethic Washington makes paying work impossible by cutting back on daycare funds and training programs. In anticipation of the termination of federal operating subsidies, MTA raises fares—predicted to reach $1.40 a ride by 1985. For parochial school students, fares have already increased from 25 cents to 40 cents. For a family with four such students, this increase will cost an additional $24 a month in transportation expenses.

At a time when active parental support is needed to keep education a local funding priority, families are themselves so hard-pressed that schools will need to do ever more with ever less just to provide a secure and supportive environment in which to get to the business of educating the children in their care. Title I, which has encouraged informed parent participation where most needed, is in jeopardy. This program has consistently developed strong local leadership which eventually benefits an entire community.

You have asked about the City's response to the staggering array of setbacks with which we are faced. To date, we have fought, as best we can, on every front, to stop what now seems the inevitable. We appreciate your own fine leadership in the endless battles waged. With greater need among our people and fewer resources with which to meet them, we must negotiate priorities, in good faith, among ourselves as citizens. We must do whatever is necessary to survive and grow as a City until the tide turns, as it must and as we must make it. This requires a certain unity and spirit of good will among us, such as crisis generally inspires.

This may be the one good which emerges from these spiteful times, an informed and unified citizenry which moves to shape local policy and, eventually, to turn back a national steamroller fueled solely by one group's willingness to flatten every other. This movement will logically begin in the public schools, whose Citywide network is already in place and whose diverse constituents can already agree on at least one priority, the quality education of our children. The rest will grow from that viable base and formulate the realCity's real response to its own government's actions. In the interim, I appreciate the chance to be involved in the challenge with such fine colleagues in Congress and in the neighborhoods of our City. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Pat Clarke.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1982.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are well aware, the current administration believes that if the federal government relinquishes funding for a number of community arts and education programs, the "private sector" will be able to pick up the slack. I am enclosing a copy of a letter from one of my constituents that I believe shows the unrealistic nature of this policy.

The Sacramento Area State Parks Docent Council Association recently wrote to more than 200 private foundations requesting assistance in developing curriculum materials for school field trips to California's new state railroad museum in Sacramento. For its efforts, the association received only three positive answers and raised less than $150. It is my understanding this is not an isolated example.

For that reason, I request that the enclosed letter be considered by the committee as it deliberates legislation and that it be made of any public file on this issue.

If I may provide you further information, please contact me. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT T. MATSUI,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, Calif., February 22, 1982.

Congressman ROBERT MATSUI,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Enclosed you will find a copy of letter sent to try to raise a "moderate" amount of funds for a curriculum project. I am also sending copies of the various ways in which "the private sector" has said "No."

I think this is an interesting study in response to "volunteerism."

We are going to publish a curriculum guide. It will not, however, be the polished publication for which we had hoped. Also, there will be little chance for in-service implementation. Further, our ideas for an area-wide (then state) Social Studies Fair similar to "Science Fair" will not be accomplished.

The point is that these kinds of activities would best be accomplished under direction of a full-time consultant in the Social Studies who had support staff. That person would also be working with district personnel who felt it was an integral part of their regular job, not just "one more thing" added to other responsibilities.

This is typical of what is happening throughout education. Persons in creative leadership roles have either been eliminated entirely, or they are working in positions that combine so many functions that they just "skim the surface" on all—not feeling satisfied that any major task is done in the way it could or should be done.

You no doubt have some constituents who could care less about creative projects—whether they be related to social studies, the arts, or reading. But these are the essence of true education—the difference between existence and civilization.

We are making choices now about the nature of society in years to come as we make educational decisions today. I hope you look through these materials and ponder what they mean. I believe they say: Public schools need to be funded beyond the poverty level if we want more than poverty education. Are private individuals or corporations going to step in and fill in all the extras? Hardly. That sounds good on national television, but it simply isn't working.

Thank you for pondering.

Personal regards,

(Mrs.) ESTHER FRANKLIN,
Consultant, School Library Services.

Enclosures.

SACRAMENTO AREA STATE PARKS,
DOCENT COUNCIL ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, Calif., October 18, 1981.

This letter is intended to introduce you to an educational committee interested in developing curriculum aids which will make field trips to the new California State Railroad Museum more meaningful experiences for school students.

We are very aware of the economic restraints of the public schools, and assume that if field trips are to be continued, they must be focused on regular school curriculum, not be merely a pleasure sightseeing tour.

You probably are aware that students study California history and U.S. history in the elementary school curriculum in grades four, five, and eight. Our curriculum committee is going to plan curriculum materials for students with reading and interest levels of these age groups. We believe the kinds of materials needed include printed booklets for students, teaching units to offer instructional ideas and methods to the teachers, and visual materials such as posters, filmstrips and films or videotapes. Three dimensional displays could be packaged, too.

All the materials developed should meet certain criteria: (a) Be an integral part of the regular classroom instruction, and thus strengthen students' ability to read, write, and compute; (b) Motivate students to want to learn; (c) Be keyed to the reading and interest levels of students in grades 4 through 8; (d) Be attractively packaged, so teachers will want to use them; and (e) Be inexpensive—since schools have limited funds for text/curriculum materials.

Now we come to our reason for contacting you. We believe you are interested in students and what goes on in school programs. We also believe you are a contributor to the growth and development of the historical resources of Sacrmento.

For this reason we are inviting you to contribute fifty dollars ($50) to assist us in organizing, writing, developing graphics and duplicating the products we believe are essential for the purposes noted above. If you feel this new state museum is a meaningful resource, we urge you to participate. Acknowledgements will appear on materials developed.

Checks may be made payable to Rio Linda Union School District, with a notation on the check indicating the donation is for the Sacramento Area Railroad Curriculum Committee (S.A.R.C.C.). They should be mailed to:

Mr. Don Walker,
Rio Linda Union School District,
Rio Linda, Calif. 95673

Sincerely,

(MRS.) ESTHER FRANKLIN,
Curriculum Committee Coordinator.